Extreme Unction.

IMPRIMATUR.

Septemb. 29. 1687.

Hic Liber cui Titulus [A Discourse of Extreme Unction, *&c.*]

JO. BATTELY.

1st Discourse

A DISCOURSE

Concerning the

PRETENDED SACRAMENT

OF

Extreme Unction.

With an account of the Occasions and Beginnings of it in the Western Church.

In Three Parts.

With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Bishop of *Condom*.

LONDON:
Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. *Paul's* Church-yard, MDCLXXXVII.

To the Reverend Father the Vindicator of the Biſhop of Condom's *Expoſition.*

Reverend Sir,

THIS Diſcourſe of *Extreme Unction* had gone into the World without any Preface to the Reader, had not your *Vindication* obliged me to direct one to you, who, it may be, will find your ſelf concerned to peruſe the following Papers. I could not by any means ſuffer my ſelf to be diverted from reading your Book that was publiſhed laſt Week, and that not meerly for gratifying a more than uſual Curioſity to ſee what you had to ſay; but rather for the informing of my Judgment; ſince I could not eaſily believe that in ſaying ſo much as you have done, you ſhould yet ſay nothing to the purpoſe. And therefore you may be ſure, I did not fall aſleep, when I came to the Article of *Extreme Unction*, but gave you full attention there, becauſe I had ſo lately dwelt upon that Argument, and was juſt then publiſhing my Thoughts about it. Shall I ſpeak my Mind freely? It was to me indifferent whe-

whether I ſhould find my ſelf obliged to retract any thing that I had written, or to tell you, as I do, that you have given me no Reaſon at all to do ſo. I am as unwilling to anticipate the Defence of that Worthy Perſon againſt whom you are engaged, as to neglect all notice of your *Vindication* in a point wherein I am this moment particularly concerned: And therefore I ſhall tell you generally and briefly how the matter ſtands, becauſe there ſeems to be a fitneſs in it, but without pretending to deſerve any Thanks from him, or to expect any from you.

As for what you ſay upon the Text of St. *James*, the main Queſtion is, whether from thoſe Indefinite Words, *Is any ſick among you*, taken in Connexion with thoſe that follow, there be more reaſon to believe that it was a ſtanding part of the Presbyters Office to anoint any Chriſtian whatſoever in his Sickneſs, for the Forgiveneſs of his Sins; or from thoſe Words, *The Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up?* To conclude that the Apoſtle having directed all the Sick to ſend for the Elders of the Church, did immediately take notice of a Caſe that happened but ſometimes, *viz.* that of a miraculous Cure upon the *Prayer of Faith*, in which caſe the Sick were to be *anointed with Oil in the Name of the Lord.*

Now,

Now, Sir, I beg leave to tell you that tho there are many Inducements to the latter Opinion offered in the Firſt part of this Work, which you ſeem not to have been aware of, yet I cannot find any one Exception againſt that, or any Reaſon for the former Opinion in all your performance, which I have not prevented in mine. Which will be ſo evident to thoſe who care to take the pains of comparing you and me together: that I need not fear to be ſuſpected of Inſincerity, in deſiring you *whoſe Zeal will not ſuffer you to mitigate the earneſt deſire you have for the Salvation of your Brethren*; in deſiring you, I ſay, to animadvert upon theſe Papers; and that for the Author's ſake, who is, I dare ſay, no leſs concerned to be ſaved, than you are that he ſhould be ſo. You know the Council of *Trent* has damn'd us (as far as *Anathematizing* goes) for denying your Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*. If you do in good earneſt believe there was Cauſe for it, let us ſee that you do ſo, by ſparing a little of your Charity to ſave us, if it may be, from this damning Error. Reply, *p.* 190.

Certainly I could not deſire to meet with a Man more fit for this Undertaking than you would ſeem to be. For you it ſeems can prove that Extreme Unction is a *Practice that came down from the Apoſtles, and was from Age to Age viſibly continued in all Chriſtian* Reply, *p.* 70, 71.

ſtian Churches both of the Eaſt and Weſt for 800 *Years*: *How*, ſay you, *did the Greek and Latin Churches for the firſt* 800 *Years practiſe this Unction*; *and do Proteſtants, who pretend to reform according to the Primitive Purity, reject it?* I perceive you are very ſure of it; pray therefore will you try to make me ſo too, for if you do, I promiſe you to examin all thoſe Reaſons from the place over again, which led me to an Interpretation of St. *James* different from yours, and that with a double Severity; tho you ſhould not think it needful to paſs the leaſt Reflection upon them. For I aſſure you it is the practice of the Church for more than 800 Years, and eſpecially the practice of the Firſt ſix Ages, as I underſtand it, that induces me not a little to believe our Interpretation of St. *James* to be the true one; which you muſt not blame me for, who ſay, that *the beſt way of proving things from Scripture is to ſhew Antiquity underſtood it ſo.*

Reply. *p.* 6.

But if you thought that your Word ought to be taken in ſo great a Point, you ſhould by no means have leſſened the Authority of it, by telling two (excuſe me Reverend Father! for ſo it is) I ſay, two Tales, in the very ſame Breath wherein you delivered your Oracle about the Antiquity and Univerſality of *Extreme Unction.*

One

One Tale is, and 'tis a notable one, that the Defender himself confessed *this Extreme Unction* to be so Ancient and Universal a Practice as you would have it thought to be. Surely if you do not make better Proof out of the Fathers than you have done by the Confession of the Defender, we must look out for a new Man to *prove* to us Extreme Unction *by the Universal Practice and Tradition of the Church*, as you speak. I find indeed the Defender confessing that that *Interpretation of the Words of St.* James *which he followed, was for* 800 *Years esteemed the undoubted meaning of them*, and that *the ancient Liturgies of the Church, and the publick practice of it, do for above* 800 *Years shew that they esteemed this Unction*, i. e. *St.* James's Unction, *to belong primarily to bodily Cures, and but secondarily only to the Sickness of the Soul.* Now that he should therefore confess Extreme Unction to have been of so ancient standing, is to make him say the quite contrary to what he does say. For the Unction of which he spake, was not *Extreme*, but brought to shew that *Extreme Unction* did not in all that time obtain in the Church. I pass by your Insinuation that he supposed the Unction mentioned by St. *James* was practised by the Primitive Church for the first 800 Years. He said no such thing, nor supposed any such thing, but only that for 800 Years they esteemed

Def. p. 42, 45.

ſteemed St. *James's* Unction to belong primarily to Bodily Cures; which they might do, and yet in leſs time than 800 Years they might bring in an Unction different from that of St. *James*, though both of them were primarily deſigned for Bodily Cures. In the following Diſcourſe I have ſhewn that they not only might do ſo, but that they did do ſo. But I paſs by this, till you give further occaſion to diſplay the Artifice of theſe Inſinuations, which for the preſent I ſhall leave to your Reader's Diligence to gather, if he will take the pains to compare you with the Defender in this Article.

The other Tale is, and 'tis Brother to the former, That *Cardinal* Cajetan *did not poſitively ſay, as the* Defender *affirmed he did*; who affirmed that Cardinal *Cajetan* freely confeſſed the Words of St. *James* could belong to no other than Bodily Cures. This, Sir, quite diſheartned me, for I took the Cardinal's Confeſſion to be ſo poſitive, that I tranſlated it out of the Cardinal himſelf, and inſerted it into a convenient Place of the following Book ‖, where any one may find it, and ſo may judg betwixt you and us in this Matter. For I intend not to produce the Place here too, and to argue the Point preciſely, becauſe 'tis ſo clear that there is no need of words to make an honeſt Man underſtand

‖ *Diſc.* p. 13.

ſtand it; and all the Words in the World will ſignify nothing if a Man be not ſo honeſt as he ſhould be. The only Pretence you have that the Cardinal did not poſitively ſay, what the Defender affirmed him to have ſaid, is, that the Defender did not give the Cardinal's own Words, but what he conceived to be his Sence. For he did not tranſlate him as I have done. But, Reverend Father, it muſt be ſuch another Man as you ſeem to be, who reads the Cardinal's Words, and will not allow him to be as *poſitive* for us, as the Defender ſaid he was. But the worſt of all is this, that you do upon this very occaſion accuſe the Defender of *Falſification*, that is, of Falſifying *Cajetan*, as you tell us in the Margin. *I told him*, ſaid you, *Firſt, that Cardinal* Cajetan *did not poſitively ſay as he affirmed he did.* So that by your own Confeſſion you told him ſo in your former Book, and therefore this ſeems to be a very deliberate Buſineſs, and you ſtand in it ſtill. *But*, then you ſay, *what if he had?* Why truly then the Defender did not falſify *Cajetan*, as you it ſeems are reſolved to ſay that he does. And thus, where you accuſe the Defender of one Falſification, you are your ſelf guilty of two Falſifications in the compaſs of five Lines; one of which is ſo much the more inexcuſable, becauſe it conſiſts in accuſing ano-

ther falſly of the ſame Crime. For theſe Reaſons, Sir, we deſire to be excuſed, as to believing that all Antiquity goes this way and that way, becauſe you ſay ſo.

But becauſe I would not be thought unreaſonable, I ſhall be content if inſtead of proving Antiquity to be for ye, you will anſwer the Arguments of the Second Part to the contrary. Only I deſire you not to repeat any thing you have ſaid here, which you will find ſatisfied there. For inſtance, that the ancient Prayers made mention of Remiſſion of Sins, as well as of Bodily Cures; for you will find that * this has been conſidered to your Hand.

* *Diſc.* p. 99, 100, 106.

And that your Work may ſtill be leſs; I think it were good advice if you would ſpare the Defender's pains too a little; that is to ſay, whereas you have ſolemnly ranged by Pages and Articles, his *Calumnies*, *Falſifications*, *falſe Tranſlations*, *Unſincerities*, *uncharitable Accuſations*, *wilful Miſtakes of your Doctrine*, *affected Miſapplications*, &c. *Falſe Impoſitions*, *Authors miſapplied*, *and plain Contradictions*; you would do well to put out an Advertiſement, ſignifying and confeſſing, that there is not one Tittle of all this true, nor any Colour for any part of this ſpiteful Charge, excepting in the Tranſlation, of the 32 *Can.* of *Seſſ.* vi. of C. *Tr.*

which

which you note *p.* 48 of your Reply: In which the Defender truſting to one to tranſlate that Canon for him, who did not ſufficiently remark the pointing of it, was led into that Miſtake which you there obſerve, and which your ſelf in the ſame place in good meaſure acquit him of, by confeſſing that he underſtood that ſame Canon aright but in the very next Page: And had you only added that he made no uſe of that Miſtake in the management of his Argument from that Canon, as in Juſtice you ſhould have done, you would then have expoſed only your own Diſpoſition to Cavil, but have done as little prejudice by this, as you have by all the reſt to the Defenders Honeſty or Underſtanding. And 'tis ſo very ſmall a matter which here you tax him for, and he, I aſſure you, has ſuch an untoward buſineſs againſt you in this very place, that I cannot afford to abate any thing of the foreſaid Advice; to confeſs once for all. I know not but he may be perſwaded to tarry a Month or thereabouts, to ſee whether you will be thus ingenuous, and diſcreet.

You may expect to have employment enough beſides, in vindicating the Doctrine of your Articles, for I am told that, God willing, you will have another *Defence* in a little time; and we are apt to think that it will give you and Monſieur

de

de Meaux another Years work, to put Words together.

Reply, p. 188. p. 173. I have but one Word more. The Biſhop *begs of Almighty God in the anguiſh of his Soul*, &c. you *conjure the* Defender *by all that is Sacred*, &c. *by the Eternal God, and his Son Chriſt Jeſus*, &c. Reverend Sir! Men that are not in earneſt may uſe the moſt amazing Expreſſions to make the World believe they are: But *be not deceived, God is not mocked*; as you will find. And in the mean time thoſe that are honeſt and wiſe will not ſo much conſider who they are that break forth into the moſt vehement Exclamations, as who they are that bring the cleareſt Proofs. Sir, I am

Your Friend and Servant, &c.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

PART. I.

That the Places of Scripture produced for it are against it.

Pag.

Sect. 1. WHAT *the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church is concerning Extreme Unction.* 1

§. 2. *That Extreme Unction can by no means be proved from St.* James, *chap.* v. 14, 15. 6

§. 3. *The true Interpretation of St.* James's *Words.* 13

§. 4. *What was signified by Anointing with Oil in St.* Mark. 16

§. 5. *What is meant by the* Prayer of Faith, *and by having* committed Sins which shall be forgiven. 24

§. 6. *That our Interpretation of the Use of Anointing in St.* James *and not our Adversaries, is favoured by the following Passages to the End of his Epistle.* 36

§. 7. *Objections against our Interpretation answered.* 41

§. 8. *That St.* James's *Text affords useful Admonitions, though it is far from establishing a Sacrament of Extreme Unction.* 45

PART. II.

That 'tis a late Innovation, and has no ground in Antiquity.

Sect. 1. *What Anointings were used in the antient Church.* 49

§. 2. *That the Unction of the Sick in the Antient Church confirms our Interpretation of St.* Mark *and St.* James. 54

§. 3.

Pag.

§. 3. *That Extreme Unction has not the Testimony of any Antient Pope.* 54

§. 4. *Nor of any Antient Council.* 73

§. 5. *Nor of any Antient Father.* 79

§. 6. *That the Silence of Antiquity, and the Circumstances with which it is to be taken, are a positive Proof, that Extreme Unction has not the Tradition of the Antients, but is a notorious Innovation.* 87

§. 7. *Of the Occcasions and Beginnings of Extreme Unction; How vast a Change it made from the Primitive Unction, and by what Degrees it was made.* 94

§. 8. *That this Innovation was not Universal, the Unction of the* Greek *Church at this day being not Extreme Unction, but that of the Antients.* 108

PART. III.

That the Appeal to Reason in behalf of this pretended Sacrament is altogether vain.

Sect. 1. THat the pretence to prove any thing to be a Sacrament by mere Reason, is an absurd Presumption. 110

§. 2. *That the Reason brought to prove that Extreme Unction was fit to be instituted has not so much as any probability.* 116

§. 3. *That more congruous Reasoning may be offered against it, than for it.* 123

§. 4. *An Apology for this Controversy about Extreme Unction from the great moment of it.* 125

§. 5. *The Church of* England *and other* Protestant *Churches, justified in not anointing the Sick at all.* 130

§. 6. *An Address to the Laity of the* Roman *Communion.* 134

ERRATA.

Pag. 96. line 10. for *Sacred* r. *Second.* Pag. 103. *for* §. ix. *r.* §. viii.

OF

Extreme Unction.

PART I.

That the places of Scripture produced for it, are againſt it.

§. I.

What the Doctrine of the Roman Church is, concerning Extreme Unction.

HOW well ſoever they may agree in the practice of *Extreme Unction* in the *Roman* Church; yet as to the Doctrine of it, their moſt celebrated Writers have (*a*) fall'n ſo foully one againſt another, that to know what it is from them, would coſt more pains than the Thing is worth. And therefore we will be content, and ſurely our Adverſaries will be ſo too, to take it as it is laid down by the Council of *Trent*. Which Council has given too much advantage, for us to deſire any more from the Sentiments of private Authors, which, as they without cauſe complain, we ſo often combat, while we pretend all along to attaque the Eſtabliſhed Doctrine of the Church. But if the Reaſons

(*a*) *Vid.* Dalleum de Extr. Unct. c. 2.

upon which the Council proceeded in its Decrees, were not ſo convincing, as to ſatisfy all of that Communion, but very great Men amongſt themſelves have been of contrary Opinions concerning them; this we have no Obligation upon us to diſſemble, how unwilling ſoever they may be to hear of it. I know well enough that an undue Advantage may be made of the Teſtimonies of Authors, and of the Conceſſions of Adverſaries, which are ſometimes uſed to underprop a Cauſe, that wants Truth at the bottom, and has therefore no Foundation of its own; But ſo long as the Arguments and the Anſwers which we produce in this Cauſe are good ones, I hope they will not be thought worſe of, if ſome of them ſeemed good alſo to ſome Men of no mean Figure in the Church of *Rome*.

And now let us ſee in the Firſt place what the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is concerning this pretended *Sacrament*. The Council of *Trent (b)* has delivered it in this manner.

(b) Seſſ. 14.

" Firſt of all concerning the Inſtitution of this Sacra-
" ment the Holy Synod declares and teaches, that our
" moſt gracious Redeemer who would have his Servants
" at all times provided with Saving Remedies and Defen-
" ces againſt all the Weapons of all their Enemies, as he
" has by other Sacraments ſupplied *Chriſtians* with thoſe
" mighty Aids, by which they may in the Courſe of
" their Life keep themſelves unhurt by all the greater
" Miſchiefs that can happen to their Souls; ſo by the
" Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* he has ſet a moſt ſure
" Guard about them, to make good the end of their Life.
" For tho our Adverſary does all our Life long ſeek and
" catch at every occaſion, by any means to devour our
" Souls; yet there is no time when he ſtrains more ve-
" hemently to exert the utmoſt of his Craft to ruine us
" utterly,

" utterly, and if he can poſſibly, to bereave us of all " Truſt in the Mercy of God, then when he perceives " the end of our Life to be at hand.

" But this Holy *Unction* of the Sick was *Inſtituted* by " our Lord *Chriſt*, as a Sacrament of the New Teſtament " truly and properly ſo called; *Inſinuated* indeed by St. " *Mark*, but *recommended* and *publiſhed* to the Faithful by " St. *James* the Apoſtle, and Brother of our Lord. Says " he, *Is any one Sick, &c.* In which Words, as the Church " has learned by Apoſtolical Tradition delivered from " hand to hand, he teaches the *Matter*, the *Form*, the " proper *Miniſter*, and *Effect* of this Saving Sacrament. " For the Church has underſtood the *Matter* thereof to " be Oil Bleſſed by a Biſhop. For this *Unction* does " moſt fitly repreſent the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, by " which the Soul of the ſick Perſon is inviſibly annoint- " ed: And that the *Form* thereof is this; *By this Holy Unction and by his moſt Holy Mercy, God forgive thee whatſoever Sin thou haſt committed by ſeeing, by hearing, by taſting, by ſmelling, and by touching. Amen.* Which Form is repeated ſeverally in anointing the ſeat of each Senſe; and according to the (c) *Florentine* Fathers in anointing the *Feet* alſo for the Sins of walking, and the *Reins* for the Senſuality that reigned there.

(c) Decret. Eugenii IV. in Conc. Florent. Catech. ad Paroc. de Extr. U. §. 21.

" Moreover the thing ſignified, and the effect of this " Sacrament is explained in theſe Words, *And the Prayer* " *of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him* " *up; and if he have committed Sins, they ſhall be forgiven* " *him.* For the thing here ſignified, is the Grace of the " Holy Ghoſt, whoſe anointing cleanſeth from Tranſ- " greſſions, (if any yet remain to be expiated) and from " the Reliques of Sin; and eaſeth and ſtrengthneth the " Soul of the ſick Perſon, by exciting in him a great con- " fidence in the Divine Mercy; whereby he is in that

" manner ſupported, that the Trouble and Pain which
" he ſuſtains by his Sickneſs becomes more tolerable, and
" he reſiſts more eaſily the Temptations of the Devil
" now cloſely lying in wait for him, and ſometimes,
" when it is expedient for the Welfare of the Soul, ob-
" tains the recovery of his Bodily Health.

" But then as to the Perſons who are deſigned, whether
" to receive or to adminiſter this Sacrament, this alſo is
" delivered, and that not obſcurely in the foregoing
" Words. For it is there ſhewn, that the proper Mini-
" ſters of this Sacrament, are the *Presbyters* of the Church,
" by which Word here we are not to underſtand the
" more Aged, or Honourable amongſt the People, but ei-
" ther Biſhops or Prieſts, *&c.* It is declared alſo that this
" Unction is to be miniſtred to the Sick, but to thoſe e-
" ſpecially, who are ſo dangerouſly ill, that they ſeem to
† Sacramentum exeuntium. " be paſt Recovery; whence it is alſo called the † *Sacra-*
" *ment of the Dying.* If the ſick Perſons recover after
" having received this Unction, they may again be re-
" lieved by it, when the like danger of Death happens.
" Wherefore they are by no means to be hearkened to,
" who againſt the manifeſt and clear Senſe of the Apo-
" ſtle *James*, teach either that this Unction is a device
" of Men, or a Rite received from the Fathers that has
" neither a Divine Command, nor a Promiſe of Grace;
" and who aſſert that it is of no longer uſe, as having
" been applied in the Primitive Church to the Gift of
" Healing only; or who ſay that the Rite and Uſage of
" the Holy *Roman* Church in the Adminiſtration of this
" Sacrament, is repugnant to the Senſe of St. *James*, and
" therefore to be altered; Laſtly, who affirm that this
" Extreme Unction may without Sin be contemn'd by
" the Faithful. For all theſe things are moſt evidently
" contrary to the perſpicuous Words of ſo great an Apo-
" ſtle, *&c.*

So

So that in the Church of *Rome*, Extreme Unction is a Sacrament administred to dying Persons, the proper Effect whereof is the cleansing of them from the Remains of Sin, by the Grace of the Holy Ghost; and as appears by the Form of Words used in the Administration, it is applied in order to the forgiveness of all Sins that have been committed by means of any of the Senses. That Authority which they pretend for this Sacrament is indeed the highest, for they say it was *instituted* by *Christ*. The proof which they produce for this Institution, is that it was *insinuated* by St. *Mark*, and *publish'd* by St. *James*. That the Evangelist did insinuate it, and the other Apostle publish it, we have the Word and Authority of the Council of *Trent*. But I will be bold to say, that if Men are not content to rely upon the Authority of the Council, but will examine its proofs, they may easily be convinced, that neither did St. *James* publish, nor St. *Mark* insinuate any such Doctrine, or Practice as it has established. And therefore the wisest Passage in the Declaration of the Council concerning this matter, is, that *they are by no means to be hearkened unto who teach otherwise than it teaches*. For if we can but persuade Men to give us the hearing or the reading, we are very confident to make it plain, that not our Objections against this pretended Sacrament, but their Pleas for it, *are most evidently contrary to the perspicuous Words* both of the *Evangelist* who is said to *insinuate* it, and of the *Apostle* who is said to *publish* it.

§. 2.

§. 2.

That Extreme Unction *can by no means be proved from St.* James *chap. v. 14, 15.*

THE cleareſt proof they have for this pretended Sacrament are doubtleſs thoſe Words of St. *James*, ch.v.14,15. *Is any ſick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oil in the Name of the Lord: And the Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up; and if he have committed Sins, they ſhall be forgiven him.*

Now ſuppoſing that the Inſtitution of a Sacrament were implied in theſe Words, and that the outward Sign thereof were anointing with Oil, yet this could not by any means be the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* in the Church of *Rome*. For according to St. *James* the Sick Perſon was to be anointed in order to the *raiſing of him up*, or his Recovery from Sickneſs. But the Sick are anointed in that Church for *purging away the remains of their Sins*, when they ſeem to be paſt hopes of Recovery. And tho perhaps one or other may recover afterward, yet this is meerly accidental, and beſides the intention of adminiſtring their Sacrament; which they therefore call the *Sacrament of the Dying*. Nay the Sick Perſon in St. *James* was not to be anointed, only *in order* to his Recovery, but his Recovery was *certainly* to follow, for 'tis ſaid the *Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up*. Which one Obſervation is ſufficient to overthrow all the hope they have in this Text. For St. *James* does indeed adviſe anointing with Oil, but 'tis in ſuch a Caſe when moſt aſſuredly the ſick Perſon ſhould not die:

The

The Church of *Rome* alſo does require the ſame, but 'tis when nothing can be well expected but the Death of the Patient. Now which way they can gather a Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, from an Authority that requires an *Unction* which is not *Extreme*, how they can prove a Sacrament which they pretend to be proper for *dying* Perſons, from thoſe Words of Scripture that mention a *Rite never uſed* upon *dying* Perſons; a Man muſt have a great deal of Wit, or rather a good ſhare of the contrary to be able to imagine.

Which one thing ſeems to have been ſo well conſidered by † *Bellarmin*, and others after him, that they found it neceſſary to interpret theſe Words: *The Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up*, not ſo much of reſtoring Health to the Body, as of cleanſing, forgiving, and quieting the Soul. And ſo they have made St. *James* to uſe Expreſſions in ſuch a Senſe, as never Man of Underſtanding did either before or after him, till the Cauſe of the Church of *Rome* made it neceſſary for theſe Men to interpret Words againſt all Rules of Speaking. For according to the perpetual uſe of Words, what is it to *ſave the Sick*, but to ſave him from his Sickneſs? What is it to *raiſe up a ſick Man*, but to reſtore him to Health? And who would interpret theſe Expreſſions otherwiſe, but they whoſe Cauſe is deſperate if they be not otherwiſe interpreted? But if it be asked what Grounds they pretend for this Liberty of Interpretation; you muſt know that the Word, *ſaving*, indifferently refers to the healing of the Body, or to the reſtoring of the Soul; and the Word, *raiſing*, tho properly uſed of ſomething that *belongs to the Body*, yet by a *Metaphor* frequently uſed in Scripture, ſignifies alſo to *drive away ſadneſs and dulneſs from the Mind*. Which is true indeed, but nothing to the purpoſe. For tho theſe Words *ſaving* and *raiſing* may have

† Bellar. de Extr. Unct. c. 3. *Dico ſecundo, illa verba duo, &c.*

Σώζειν ἐγείρειν.

have different Significations according to the different matters ſpoken of; yet 'tis but one thing which they ſignify, when they are reſtrain'd by ſome peculiar matter. For inſtance, to *raiſe* is a Word that may be uſed to expreſs either *awakening* one that *ſleeps*; or *bringing* one that is *careleſs* to *attention*; or *comforting* the *ſorrowful*; or *recovering* a *Sick Man*; or *giving Life* to one that is *Dead*. But will any Man in his Wits, unleſs he be carried away by the Service of a Cauſe, affirm that *to raiſe him that ſleeps*, does indifferently ſignify all the other things, and not only awakening him out of his Sleep? By the ſame Reaſon *to raiſe the Sick*, can ſignify nothing but to raiſe him from his Sickneſs, and to reſtore him to Health. And tho *Bellarmin* who was reſolved to ſay ſomething for every thing, was not aſhamed to lay down ſo abſurd an Expoſition as the other is, upon Grounds ſo frivolous; yet 'tis a wonderful thing that (*d*) *Eſtius* ſhould come after him and trifle as the other does, and almoſt in his very Words. Which in ſuch a Man as he was, who ſometimes freely uſed the good Judgment which he had, is one of the greateſt Inſtances that I ever met with of the Power of Prejudice, and the neceſſity they are under of going beneath themſelves, that are forced to ſerve a Party.

(*d*) Comment. in Ep. p. 1144. *Par.*

For *Eſtius* upon this place had but a little before acknowledged that the health of the Body is ſignified by this Word σώσει, *ſhall ſave*, according to the *Expoſition of almoſt all Interpreters*. And then he adds very judiciouſly, that *ſince the Apoſtle ſpake of Bodily Sickneſs*, it is *agreeable* to the Rules of ſpeaking, to underſtand the *ſaving* which follows, of *Health of the ſame kind*, that is of Bodily Health. But then by what Authority muſt we underſtand theſe Words *ſaving* and *raiſing*, of purifying and reſtoring the Soul too? Why, ſays he, we *are*

not

not however to exclude the understanding of the Welfare and Health of the Soul under these Words. Would one believe that a Man of Judgment should talk so pitifully? For if the Health of the Body only, be expressed by the Words in Question, which is as plain as any thing needs to be made by Words, then altho the *Health of the Soul* is not excluded thereby, yet the *understanding* of the Souls Health by these Words, is to be excluded; or we must for ever despair of knowing how much and no more is signified by plain Words. If I promise a Man Food, my Words indeed do not exclude giving of him Raiment too, but they exclude any other meaning but what the Words signify, which is that I will give him Food. As for the reason added by *Estius*, why the Health of the Soul is not to be *excluded*, viz. *because bodily Health is referr'd here to the Safety of the Soul*; 'tis a most lamentable reason for understanding this by that; since it will hold as well for understanding the Health of the Soul by the *Sickness* of the Body, which is every whit as much referred to the Health of the Soul, as the Health of the Body is.

The plain truth of the Case is this; it is so evident that St. *James* by these Words means nothing else but the Recovery of Bodily Health, that these Men are forced to Shifts that were never heard of before, to make something else to be understood by them, because, otherwise their Sacrament is lost. That St. *James* does mean Bodily Health, is a Truth that stares them so fully in the Face, that they are not able to dissemble it; not *Bellarmin* himself, (*e*) tho he will not allow the gift of Healing to be meant: And therefore to draw some faint resemblance between the use of their *Extreme Unction*, and that use of *Unction* which is mentioned in St. *James*; they are forced to pretend one effect of their Sacrament to be the cure of the Body, *so far as it is expedient*, as Pope

(*e*) Bellar. de Extr. Unc. l. c. iii. §. *Quod autem nec loquatur*, &c. *Ad secundum Argumentum*, &c. c. viii. *Secundo noxiæ.*

(f) Eugen. Decret. in Conc. Flor.

(f) *Eugenius* IV says, and *when it is expedient for the welfare of the Soul*, as says the Council of *Trent*.

† Bell. de Ex. U. c. iii. *Respondeo inungit Ecclesia*, &c.

Nay *Bellarmin* tells us, That † *the Church anoints those who are in danger of Death; for then supernatural Remedies are to be sought to, when there is no hope left in those that are natural. And tho sick Persons are anointed that they may be healed, if it be expedient to their Eternal Salvation, yet 'tis rightly called Extreme Unction, because 'tis the last in respect of those Unctions which we receive in other Sacraments, in Baptism, in Confirmation, and in Orders.* One may wonder at this, till he knows the reason of it, which is, that he was now answering that grievous Objection against their arguing from St. *James*, that *their Unction is indeed Extreme, because it is given to dying Persons, but St.* James *meant not an Extreme Unction because he would have it administred to those that were to be healed.* How sadly the Cardinal was put to it, to get over this Difficulty, is evident from his Answer, where he gives such a Reason why their *Unction* is called *Extreme*, as neither stands with their practice in anointing, nor with the use of the Word *Extreme*, nor with the * Judgment of the Divines of that Church, who generally affirm with the Council of *Trent*, that Unction is appointed for the Relief of those that are going out of the World, and conclude that it is therefore called *Extreme Unction*, because it is not to be given till the Sickness is desperate. But when a Man is not able to stand before an Objection that is against him, he must seem to say the same thing that the Objection says, as *Bellarmin* here does, who one would think by these Words, makes the Recovery of the Patient the immediate end of their Unction, and will not allow the Unction to be called *Extreme*, as if it intimated the sick Man's hastning to the period of his Life.

* *Vid.* Dalleum de Extr. Unct. c. ii.

But

But does it at any time appear that their Unction restores a ſick Man to Health? or that they ſo much as expect it? Is any ſuch effect expreſſed in the Form of Adminiſtration, or any thing more than the forgiveneſs of Sins that are committed by means of the Senſes? Nay do not they call this the Sacrament of *Dying* Perſons; and to be given eſpecially to thoſe that *ſeem to be departing out of this Life?* Does not (*g*) *Bellarmin* himſelf argue for their *Extream Unction* from the convenience of being provided with a Sacrament to ſtrengthen us in our *Departure* out of this World? Nay does not the Council of *Trent* tell us that by the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, God *has ſet a moſt ſure Guard about* Chriſtians, *to make good the end of their Life?* For what reaſon therefore does the ſame Council tell us that the ſick Perſon having been anointed, does *ſometimes, when it is expedient for the welfare of the Soul, obtain the Recovery of his Bodily Health?* Why I ſay, do they in the Doctrine of this their Sacrament, mention an accident ſo impertinent to the Nature and Deſign of it, as the Recovery of Bodily Health? I anſwer, becauſe they are driven to it by an extreme neceſſity of feigning ſome reſemblance between the uſe of their *Unction*, and of that in St. *James*. For 'tis ſo plain that St. *James* promiſes bodily Health upon what he preſcribes to be done, that the Wit of Man is not able to diſguiſe it. And therefore it was abſolutely neceſſary to give ſome hint of the ſame thing in their Doctrine about *Extreme Unction*; tho he muſt either have no Eyes, or wink hard, who ſees not that 'tis thruſt in moſt impertinently, and againſt the whole tenour of their Doctrine and Practice, which plainly ſhew that 'tis not adminiſtred by them for the prolonging of Life, but for the Aſſiſtence of the Soul at the Hour of Death.

(*g*) Ibid. c. v.

Which theſe Men are ſo ſenſible of, that they dare not venture their Cauſe upon this weak Attempt of bending their Sacrament to the Text, by pretending ſome regard in their Unction to the Recovery of Bodily Health; but find themſelves obliged alſo to bend the Text as unreaſonably to their Sacrament, by pretending that St. *James* does not ſpeak of reſtoring Health only, in thoſe Words of *ſaving the Sick*, and *raiſing him up*, but of cleanſing and ſtrengthning the Soul too, as *Bellarmin* and *Eſtius* would make us believe. By which Artifice they have not done their Cauſe ſo much Service, as they have diſcovered good will to it, ſince we cannot but obſerve that themſelves were conſcious how impoſſible it is to make the Text and their Sacrament meet, without forcing both the one and the other by an unnatural Repreſentation. And yet even thus much violence will never bring them together, ſo long as 'tis manifeſt that to the uſe of this Rite of Anointing in St. *James* as it is by him required, the Recovery of Bodily Health is abſolutely promiſed; which they can with no Face pretend to be the conſtant or even frequent effect of their Extreme Unction, ſince their Doctrine and Practice proclaim it to be the Sacrament of the *Dying*.

As for the forgiveneſs of Sins mentioned in the following Words of St. *James*, it was promiſed upon a ſuppoſition that the ſick Perſon had committed Sins: *And if he had committed Sins, they ſhall be forgiven him.* Which plainly ſeems to be the ſuppoſition of a Caſe, that was not common to all that were healed upon receiving the *Unction* mentioned by the Apoſtle. And that even this Promiſe does not afford the leaſt ground for the *Unction* of the *Roman* Church, will appear when I come to explain the ſeveral Expreſſions in the Text.

In

In the mean time to ſhew that the Power of Truth does ſometimes prevail upon Men of the beſt note in the Church of *Rome*, I ſhall cloſe this Point with the Confeſſion of no meaner a Man than Cardinal *Cajetan*, who determines thus upon this place of St. *James*. "It neither appears by the Words, nor by the Effect, that he "ſpeaks of the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, but rather of that *Unction* which our Lord appointed in the "Goſpel, to be uſed upon ſick Perſons by his Diſciples. "For the Text does not ſay, *Is any Man ſick unto Death?* "but abſolutely, *Is any Man ſick?* And it makes the effect to be the recovery of the Sick, and ſpeaks but conditionally of the forgiveneſs of Sins: Whereas *Extreme Unction* is not given but when a Man is almoſt "at the point of Death, and as the Form of Words then "uſed ſufficiently ſhews, it tends directly to the forgiveneſs of Sins.

This was ſaid like an honeſt Man; and if all Men of ſenſe would ſay what they think, this Controverſy with many more would ſoon be at an end.

§. 3.

The true Interpretation of St. James's *Words.*

THO what hath been ſaid is enough to deprive the *Roman Unction* of all relief and ſupport from this place of Scripture; yet for the benefit of thoſe, who poſſibly have not well conſidered the Text of which we have been ſpeaking, I ſhall firſt offer the plain meaning of it, and ſhew for what end and purpoſe anointing with Oil was preſcribed by St. *James*; and then confirm the Interpretation by thoſe Arguments that led me to it, and by

by ſuch Anſwers as may be ſufficient to remove our Adverſaries Objections againſt it.

We ſay then, that ſeveral extraordinary *Gifts* were by the Spirit diſperſed amongſt the firſt Believers, for the eſtabliſhing of Chriſtianity in the World; and that one kind of theſe were the (*g*) *Gifts of Healing*.

(*g*) 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30.

That they who had this Power, were directed by the Impulſe of the Spirit, when or upon what Perſons to exert it. That being thus directed, they called upon the Name of the Lord with aſſurance of the Event, and the Sick were accordingly reſtored to their Health.

That ſometimes they did in this manner heal the Sick, upon whom Diſeaſes had been inflicted, as a Puniſhment for ſome Sins they had been guilty of.

That in this Direction of St. *James*, *Is any Man ſick, &c.* he refers to theſe extraordinary *Gifts of Healing*; and that he preſcribes *Anointing* the ſick Perſon *with Oil*, in that caſe only, when the Elders knew by the Spirit, that the Gift of Healing was to be ſhewn, and that *the Lord* would *raiſe him up*.

So that in caſe of Sickneſs St. *James* directs the ſick Perſon to ſend for the Elders of the Church, and adds a particular motive ſo to do from the *Gift of Healing*, which then flouriſhed in the Church, *viz.* that if it ſeemed good to God, which the Elders would aſſuredly know by the Inſtruction of the Spirit, he ſhould by their praying over him be reſtored to his Health. In which caſe to ſignify the Supernatural Gift of God in raiſing him up, they were accordſng to Cuſtom to anoint him with Oil. Whereupon the Event would ſhew that their Prayer was not the Prayer of vain Confidence, but *of Faith*, and that they had not in vain *anointed the Sick with Oil* in teſtimony of their aſſurance of his Recovery; for as he ſays *the Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord*

Lord ſhall raiſe him up. And to adviſe the ſick Man more effectually to take this Religious Courſe, he adds another Motive, that if that Sickneſs were ſent to puniſh him for ſome Sins that he had committed, even that ſhould not hinder his Recovery, any more than if it had been inflicted only for the trial of his Faith and Patience; for *his Sins ſhould be forgiven him.*

In which Interpretation the main point of Controverſy that remains between us and our Adverſaries, is that, as we ſay, the *Unction* mentioned by St. *James*, was a Rite or Ceremony of miraculous Healing. For if this proves true, all their pretence from this place to eſtabliſh a Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* for the Sanctifying of the Soul, and the forgiveneſs of their Sins who are ready to depart out of this Life, it is all I ſay irrecoverably overthrown. And therefore let us now enquire into the meaning of St. *James* his *Unction*, and ſee whether there be not ſufficient Reaſon to conclude of it as we do, and no appearance of Reaſon for what they conclude from it.

There are but three ways that I know of which the New Teſtament affords to find out the uſe and meaning of this Ceremony at the beginning of the Goſpel. One is to compare this place with *Mark* vi. 13. Another to conſider the Words of the place it ſelf. And a third to ſee what light is given to it, by the following Paſſages in St. *James* that have a manifeſt Connexion with the Text that is under Debate.

If our Interpretation will bear the trial of all theſe ways of Examination, and theirs will bear none of them; if according to ours, all things are plain, natural and conſiſtent, and if theirs diſturb every thing, and will not ſuffer thoſe things to hang together which ought to do ſo: Then I ſhould think the Authority of Scripture will plainly enough appear to be on our ſide.

§. 4.

§ 4.

What was signified by anointing with Oil in St. Mark.

I Begin with the forementioned place of St. *Mark*; which is the only Text in all the New Testament, besides that of St. *James*, where *anointing with Oil* is mentioned. There it is said of the Twelve who were sent forth by our Saviour to preach, and to confirm their Doctrine by Signs and Wonders; that *they went out and preached that Men should repent*; *and they cast out many Devils*; *and anointed with Oil many that were sick, and healed them.* In which Words it is evident that the anointing with Oil, which the Apostles used, was the Ceremony of a miraculous Cure of the Sick: For they give an account of what the Apostles did in the pursuance of that Commission, and in the use of that Power which they had received from *Christ*. But that they received Power from him to cure Diseases, is expressly affirmed by St. *Luke*(*h*), *Then he called his twelve Disciples together, and gave them Power and Authority over all Devils, and to cure Diseases*; *And he sent them to preach the Kingdom of God, and to heal the Sick.* And therefore what can be more plain than that *the healing* mentioned by St. *Mark*, was by the use of that *Power* which they had received from their Master, *i. e.* that it was miraculous? And consequently that the *anointing with Oil*, which is joined with it, was nothing else but a Symbol or Sign of the *miraculous Cure*. Now that it was very frequent to use certain outward Actions in the performance of a Miracle, is evident also from the Scriptures, such Actions namely as could by no means be thought to have any natural force in procuring the

(*h*) Luke ix. 1, 2.

the Effect, but rather to raiſe the expectation of a Miracle, and to ſignify that what would follow was to be done by a Supernatural Power. Thus before the dividing of the Red Sea (*i*), *Moſes lift up his Rod, and ſtretched out his Hand over the Sea, to divide it.* Thus alſo with his Rod (*k*) he ſmote the Rock in *Horeb*, and Water came out of it. Thus our Saviour to cure the deaf Man that had an Impediment in his Speech, (*l*) *put his Fingers into his Ears, and touched his Tongue.* And before he raiſed the young Man that was dead (*m*), he *touched the Bier.* The Examples of which kind are ſo many in both Teſtaments, that there is no need of mentioning any more. And one of them is this before us, of *anointing the Sick with Oil,* and healing them.

(*i*) Exod. xiv. 16, 21.
(*k*) xvii. 8.
(*l*) Mar. vii. 33.
(*m*) Luke vii. 14.

Which Ceremony had been of antient uſe, and was known to have a ſignification not much unlike that of *Impoſition of Hands.* It was commonly uſed to denote the conferring either of Authority and Office, or Gifts and Graces enabling for the Adminiſtration thereof. Whence it might by an eaſy Turn be applied, (as *Impoſition of Hands* undoubtedly was) to ſignify ſo extraordinary a Gift and Favour of God to a ſick Man, as that of raiſing him up by a miraculous Power. Eſpecially, if as *Grotius* has obſerved, it was an ancient Cuſtom amongſt the *Hebrews* as to join *Impoſition of Hands* to thoſe Prayers which were offered in any Man's behalf; ſo when Prayers were made for the Sick to *anoint them with Oil,* in token of their Hope to obtain from God that eaſe and gladneſs in their behalf, which is ſignified by Oil. So that anointing with Oil having antiently betokened ſometimes ſome ſingular Gift of God, at other times the hope of obtaining the Recovery of the ſick Man, for whom Prayer was made, it might well be a very apt and ſignificant Emblem of a miraculous cure of the Sick; which being both an

Grot. in loc.

extraordinary work, and withal the cauſe of Joy and Gladneſs, the uſe of anointing upon this occaſion did in ſome degree join both its ancient ſignifications together.

But whatever the reaſon might be of the choice of this Ceremony when the Apoſtles healed many ſick Perſons: This however is very plain, that they healed them by a miraculous Power which their Maſter had given them. And by comparing what St. *Mark* ſays upon this occaſion, with St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke*, it ſeems to me that *anointing with Oil* was not only a Rite uſed by them to ſignify the miraculous Cure, but that this meaning of it was generally underſtood. My Reaſon is this, becauſe St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke*, who make no mention of the Ceremony, do expreſly affirm the Power of healing to be a Gift which they had now received from *Jeſus*: And St. *Mark* who mentions not the Gift, does only expreſs the Ceremony which they uſed in healing. Therefore becauſe in ſubſtance they all deliver the ſame thing, it ſhould ſeem that St. *Mark* ſufficiently expreſſed the miraculous Gift by which the Apoſtles healed the Sick, by ſaying that they *Anointed many with Oil that were Sick, and healed them*; and by conſequence that the uſe of this Ceremony upon ſuch an occaſion was ſufficiently underſtood to be an Indication of a miraculous Cure.

What St. *Luke* reports, we have ſeen already; and St. *Matthew* is no leſs expreſs, *viz.* that *(n) He gave his twelve Diſciples Power againſt unclean Spirits, to caſt them out; and* TO HEAL ALL MANNER OF SICKNESS, AND ALL MANNER OF DISEASE, and that he ſaid to them, *Heal the Sick, cleanſe the Lepers, raiſe the Dead, caſt out Devils: Freely ye have received, freely give; i.e.* The Power by which ye are to do theſe things is Supernatural and coſt you nothing, and you ſhall take nothing for the uſe of it. But now (o) St. *Mark* mentions

(n) Matth. 10. 1, 8.

(o) Mark vi. 7.

tions no other Power in the Commiſſion which *Jeſus* gave them, but that *over unclean Spirits:* And yet deſcribing what they did in purſuance of their Commiſſion, he ſays, (*p*) *They caſt out many Devils, and anointed with Oil many that were Sick, and healed them*; which Words being compared with what the other Evangeliſts ſay, are to be interpreted in this manner. *And as for the Sick which they healed, that was done no leſs by a Divine and Supernatural Power, than the caſting out of Devils; for they uſed nothing but the known Ceremony betokening an extraordinary work of God in the Cures they wrought, that is, Anointing with Oil.* And thus thoſe Words of St. *Mark* do plainly enough ſuppoſe that Power of healing the Sick to have been in their Commiſſion, tho he did not at firſt expreſs it as the other two Evangeliſts did.

(*p*) Mar. vi. 13.

Finally, it doth not appear that our Saviour enjoined the uſe of this Ceremony, but it is rather probable that he did not, ſince the Apoſtles healed many Perſons without it. And therefore if one ſhould ſay that poſſibly they took it up of themſelves, as a Rite very pertinent for them to uſe upon this occaſion, and which would eaſily be underſtood by all, I do not ſee how he could be confuted. Perhaps it may not be unreaſonably ſuppoſed that they received ſome general Direction from our Saviour, that in exerting the Gift which he had beſtowed upon them, they might freely uſe this honourable Ceremony or ſome other of like ſignification, that was fit to raiſe the expectation of a miraculous Healing.

Now this being the only place in the New Teſtament, where anointing with Oil is mentioned, beſides that of St. *James*, and it being alſo plain that the *Unction* in St. *Mark* referred to the Gift of Healing, ſurely the *Unction* ſpoken of by St. *James* muſt have the ſame ſignification; or elſe 'tis a place of ſuch obſcurity, that it will be

very hard to find a Sacrament in it, or to make any concluſion whatſoever from it: For in all appearance the very ſame caſe is ſpoken of in both places. The Action is the ſame, *viz. Anointing with Oil*; the Perſons anointed are in the ſame Circumſtances, for in both they are *the Sick*: And the Event the ſame, for in St. *Mark* they were *Healed*, and in St. *James* 'tis expreſly ſaid, *The Lord ſhall raiſe him up.* What therefore ſhould hinder, but that if *Anointing* were the Ceremony of miraculous Healing in the one, it ſhould have the ſame ſignification in the other? If there were any Difficulty in the Words of St. *James*, and it were doubtful to what purpoſe the *Unction* by him mentioned was applied, one would think the obſcurity ſhould wholly diſappear before the Light that St. *Mark* offers to clear that Text. But that in all appearance the ſame Caſe ſhould be expreſſed in both, and yet there ſhould be ſo vaſt a difference as the *Roman* Doctrine ſuppoſes, is for them to believe, who make the Scriptures good for nothing, till the Church comes to find out a meaning for them.

For this reaſon ſome of our Adverſaries have thought fit to prove their pretended Sacrament out of St. *Mark*, well perceiving that without drawing him in for a Witneſs to their Doctrine, as well as they could, they muſt be forced to quit St. *James* too. Thus *Maldonate* without mincing the matter, asks *If the Sacrament of* Extreme Unction *be not here* [*in St.* Mark] *where is it?* A queſtion put not without Reaſon I confeſs; from whence I infer, that here it is not, and therefore 'tis no where to be found in the Scripture. As for his other Queſtion which he preſently adds, *Why is it not here, if it be any where elſe?* I anſwer, that if he could have made good proof that he had found it any where elſe, he would never have ſtretched his Confidence ſo far as to pretend that he found it here.

In

‖ *In this place,* says the Jesuit, *we are to deal not only with Hereticks, who obstinately contend that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is not here spoken of, but also with certain Catholicks, who seem to say almost the same thing, who are nevertheless excusable in great part, since these new Heretics had not yet sprung up in their time.* And he was so well satisfied that their Sacrament was gone, if St. *Mark*'s Text could not save it, that he plainly said; that to deny this place to be understood of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, was to *make a step* towards the taking of it away, either *maliciously* if he were an *Heretic* that did so, or *imprudently* if he were a *Catholic*. ‖ Maldon. Comm. in Evang. Marc. vi.

He well knew that the Divines of his Church had generally denied the Unction which the Apostles used in St. *Mark*, to be their Sacramental Unction, and that they had laid the stress of their Cause upon St. *James*; but he saw the Inconvenience of it too, that the same Unction being indeed spoken of in both places, by giving up one, they in effect yeilded both, and so left their Sacrament without any Testimony of Scripture at all. Thus far therefore his Judgment is to be commended, that he chose rather to challenge both places, which might be done with the same Confidence and the same Pains that would serve to challenge one of them, than to be at the Charge of wresting St. *James*, and afterwards to be at a new expence of pains in making St. *Mark* and St. *James* to speak of two different Unctions, *i. e.* to shew a Difference where in Truth there was none to be shown.

But how does this bold Undertaker bring St. *Mark*'s Text to his Purpose? Why, he proves that the Apostles did not use Oil as a Medicine, as if any either Protestant or Papist was so weak as to say they did: And then he concludes that they anointed the Sick, not *to cure their Bodies*, so much as *their Minds* by a Sacrament; as if that

that Unction muſt needs be a Sacrament, or a Medicine. He pretends that it could not be uſed as a Sign of a miraculous Cure, becauſe it would have obſcured the Miracle, and led the Spectators into a belief that the Cure was wrought by the natural force of the Oil. And ſome other ſuch things he ſays which are ſo intolerably trifling, that I am very well pleaſed to be excuſed from giving them any anſwer, by the Confeſſion of the moſt and beſt Divines of the *Roman* Church, that the Unction in St. *Mark* was not Sacramental, or for the healing of the Mind, but the Body. For this was not taught by *Cajetan* only, but by (*q*) *Gregory de Valentia*, and by (*r*) *Bellarmin*, who recites other great Authors of the ſame Opinion: And that we may be ſure the Stream runs on this Side, I ſhall need to do no more than to produce that Famous Paſſage in the Council of *Trent* concerning this matter which *Soave* has given us an account of.

(*q*) Tom. iv. Diſp. 8. qu. 1.
(*r*) De Extr. Unct. cap. ii. *Probo igitur*, &c.

We have already obſerved that part of the Doctrine of the Council concerning Extreme Unction, was this, that *it was inſtituted by our Lord* Chriſt *as a Sacrament of the New Teſtament truly and properly ſo called*; *INSINUATED by St.* Mark, *and publiſhed to the Faithful by St.* James. " Now, ſays the Hiſtorian, if any mar-
" vel why it is ſaid in the firſt Head of the Doctrine
" that this Sacrament is *inſinuated* by *Chriſt* our Lord in
" St. *Mark*, and *publiſhed* in St. *James*, tho the Reaſon of
" what goes before, and of that which follows, does
" require that it ſhould not be ſaid *INSINUATED*,
" but *INSTITUTED*, he may know that it was firſt
" written ſo: But a Divine having obſerved that the
" Apoſtles who anointed the Sick, of whom St. *Mark*
" ſpeaketh, were not *Prieſts*, becauſe the Church of
" *Rome* holdeth, that Prieſthood was conferred upon

Hiſtory of the Council of Trent. p. 351.

" them

" them not till the laſt Supper, it ſeemed a Contradi-
" ction to affirm, that the Unction which they gave
" was a Sacrament, and that Prieſts only are Miniſters
" of it. Whereunto ſome who held it to be a Sacra-
" ment, and at that time inſtituted by *Chriſt*, did anſwer,
" that *Chriſt* commanding them to miniſter the Unc-
" on, made them Prieſts concerning that action only
" —yet it was thought too dangerous to affirm it abſo-
" lutely: Therefore inſtead of the Word *Inſtitutum*,
" they put *Inſinuatum:* Which Word what it may ſigni-
" fy in ſuch a matter, every one may judg who under-
" ſtandeth what *Inſinuare* is, and doth apply it to that
" which the Apoſtles then did, and to that which was
" commanded by St. *James*, and to the Determination
" made by this Council.

I am far from thinking that Divine's Reaſon againſt St. *Mark*'s ſpeaking of a Sacramental Unction, to be the very beſt that the Caſe affords. However we ſee that tho the Council had a good mind to build their Doctrine upon St. *Mark*'s Text, they yet diſtruſted the Foundation, and could not heartily venture upon it, and therefore they durſt not ſay their Sacrament was here *Inſtituted:* But on the other hand they were loth to loſe the Countenance of a Text in a Cauſe wherein they needed it ſo very much, and therefore they were content to ſay modeſtly that it was *Inſinuated* there. A hard Caſe indeed! that the Holy Synod ſhould have ſo little Judgment, as to ſay *Inſtituted* at firſt, and ſo little honeſty as to put *Inſinuated* afterward inſtead of *Inſtituted:* For I think no other account can be given of this, but that themſelves would fain inſinuate what they durſt not ſay; that the Words of St. *Mark* did after a ſort contain an Inſtitution of their Sacrament, tho their ſhifting plainly ſhewed that they were convinced of the contrary.

But

But that place belonging quite to another matter, *i. e.* to the Gift of Healing; and all reason requiring that St. *James*'s Words be interpreted to the same Sence with St. *Mark*'s; this alone is enough to overthrow their Pretence of proving Extreme Unction from St. *James*.

And here it may be observed that the Power of Truth has extorted from some or other of our Adversaries, the Confession of both the Premises which infer our Conclusion; *That Unction which St.* James *prescribes is the very same with that which is mentioned by St.* Mark. For this we have *Maldonate*, and some few others with him. *But St.* Mark *does not speak of Extreme or of Sacramental Unction.* For this we have *Bellarmin* and a great many more. The Conclusion is evident, *Therefore neither does St.* James *prescribe any such thing*. And thus much for the first way of finding out the use and meaning of this Ceremony whereof St. *James* speaks, *viz.* by comparing him with St. *Mark*.

§. 5.

What is meant by the Prayer of Faith, *and by having* committed Sins *which* shall be forgiven.

THE second way I propounded was to consider the meaning of that place, where St. *James* mentions *Anointing the Sick with Oil.*

I have already shewn that those Expressions of *saving the Sick*, and *the Lord's raising him up*, cannot without extravagant Liberty, be understood of any thing else but the Recovery of Bodily Health; [§. 2.] and I have laid down that Interpretation of the whole Text which this Supposition requires [§. 3.] and shewn that the Unction

Unction there ſpoken of muſt therefore have been the Ceremony of a miraculous Cure. Now there are but two paſſages there, that ſeem to require any farther Illuſtration, which I ſhall now conſider more particularly, and then leave the Reader to give his Judgment.

The one is *the Prayer of Faith*; the other, *If he has committed Sins, they ſhall be forgiven him.* Now,

1. By *the Prayer of Faith*, we muſt neceſſarily underſtand Prayer accompanied with a perſuaſion wrought by the Impulſe of the Spirit, that God would raiſe up the Sick; not with that Faith only which is a perſuaſion of the general Promiſes of God made to the whole Church; ſince there is no ſuch abſolute Promiſe in the Goſpel, that God will grant Health to the Sick upon our Prayer. But St. *James* affirms, that *the Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up.* Which makes it plain that the Faith here mentioned was the perſuaſion of the Elders that it was God's pleaſure that at that time the *Gift of Healing* ſhould take place: For, as I ſaid before, Prayer grounded upon the belief of the Promiſes of the New Covenant, or upon that Faith only which is common to all Chriſtians, cannot warrant the obtaining of Health, or of any other Temporal Bleſſing in particular.

Nor is this the only place where *Faith* is taken for a perſuaſion that God will do a Miracle. For thus we are to underſtand it in that Saying of St. *Paul* (*s*), *Though I have all Faith ſo that I could remove Mountains, and have no Charity, I am nothing.* In which he ſeemed to refer to that Saying of our Saviour to his Diſciples (*t*), *If ye have Faith as a grain of Muſtard-ſeed, ye ſhall ſay unto this Mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it ſhall remove; and nothing ſhall be impoſſible unto you.* And it is very evident that our Saviour ſpake of the

(*s*) 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

(*t*) Mat. xvii. 20.

Prayer of ſuch *Faith* as this in that Promiſe to his Diſciples (*u*), *Whatſoever ye ſhall ask in my Name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye ſhall ask any thing in my Name, I will do it. i. e.* Upon their Prayer God would glorify himſelf, and the Goſpel of his Son by the Teſtimony of Miracles: For theſe Words are a Continuation of the Promiſe made in the foregoing Verſe; *He that believeth on me, the Works that I do ſhall he do alſo, and greater Works than theſe he ſhall do, becauſe I go unto my Father.* But this is a Notion ſo generally underſtood, that I need not inſiſt upon it.

(*u*) Joh. xiv. 13. 12.

Now if the *Prayer of Faith* was made for the Recovery of the Sick Man, it ſtands to Reaſon that his being *Anointed with Oil* ſhould refer to the ſame matter. For the Apoſtle lays down this Motive to the uſe of *Prayer* and *Unction*, that *the Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick*; And thus theſe Paſſages go eaſily and conſonantly together: Whereas if the *Extreme Unction* of the Church of *Rome* be ſuppoſed in this place, the whole muſt run after this manner; *Is any Man ſick, let him ſend for the Elders of the Church; and let them adminiſter to him the Sacrament and Office of Extreme Unction, to prepare his Soul for its departure out of this Life; For if they know by the Spirit that the Gift of Healing is now to be exerciſed, and do thereupon pray for his Recovery, he ſhall not depart out of this Life, but the Lord will raiſe him up.* And who does not ſee that at this rate the Paſſages of the Text are not only incoherent, but inconſiſtent with one another?

And now it is eaſy from hence to anſwer one of *Bellarmin*'s principal Objections againſt our Senſe of this place. *This Promiſe*, ſays he, The Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, &c. *is abſolute, and therefore its principal relation*

† Bellar. de Extr. Unct. c. iii. §. *Quarto & Orati*, &c.

lation cannot be to the Health of the Body. For the Sick who were anointed as St. James *prescribes, were either always healed, or not always: If always, then none had died in the Days of the Apostles, but some very few who neglected St.* James *his Rule: Moreover Bodily Health being not always profitable to the Soul, is not always obtained from God, tho it be prayed for by one that has the Gift of Healing. They therefore that were anointed were not always healed; so that either that absolute Promise of St.* James *is false, which cannot be, or which is most true it is principally and absolutely to be referred to the Soul.* We are agreed then that the Promise upon *Unction* and the *Prayer of Faith* is absolute; but the Cardinal will not have Bodily Health to be the thing promised; for then none had died but those few that neglected to procure Unction. Now one would think that this Objection were every whit as strong against making the promised effect of Unction to be the Health of the Soul. For thus it would be impossible for any to be Damn'd, but those few that neglected to be Anointed; which is very comfortable Doctrine indeed to some People, but so false withal, that I believe our Adversaries themselves would be ashamed to defend it openly.

But there is no such Inconvenience belonging to our Interpretation of this place as the Cardinal pretends. I grant that all they were healed, who were anointed as St. *James* prescribes; but that very few must therefore have dyed in those Days, does by no means follow, unless that be supposed also, which can never be proved, *viz.* That the Presbyters without making any difference were to anoint all the Sick in those Days. But that they did not anoint all, seems very evident from this, that the Unction was to go along with *the Prayer of Faith:* But the Prayer of Faith was not

offered for All, and therefore neither were All anointed: For I have already ſhewn that by the Prayer of Faith in that place we are to underſtand asking a Miracle in the Name of *Chriſt* by the direction of the Spirit; and therefore ſuch Prayer was not offered for All indifferently, but for thoſe only whom it pleaſed God ſo to reſtore to their Health.

The Cardinal ſays moſt truly, That *Bodily Health being not always profitable to the Soul, was not always obtained from God.* But it was raſhly done to add, *though it was prayed for by one that had the Gift of Healing.* For thoſe that had the Gift of Healing were under the Direction of the Divine Spirit, when to ſhew the miraculous Gift of God, and when to forbear; they knew by that Supernatural Direction when it was for the Glory of God and the Good of the Church, or the Spiritual Advantage of the Sick Perſon, that he ſhould recover; and then followed the Prayer accompanied with an aſſurance of the Event, here called the *Prayer of Faith*, together with Unction, the uſual Rite of miraculous Healing. We have already remembred how our Lord promiſed to his Diſciples, That *whatever they ſhould ask in his Name he would do it*; and yet it is not to be thought that they ſhould be able at their own pleaſure to do Miracles, either for the gratifying of a wanton Curioſity, or when the Glory of God did not require it; but that they would ſtill be under the impulſe and guidance of the Spirit, when to undertake a miraculous Operation in the Name of the Lord *Jeſus*. Thus before ſome notable Miracles, it is ſaid of them that they were *full of the Holy Ghoſt*; *i. e.* they were raiſed by a ſtrong ſuggeſtion of the Spirit to the aſſured Expectation of thoſe great things that were

were presently done. There was not only a Divine Power that wrought those Things, but there was also a Divine Impulse upon the Minds of *Christ*'s Servants, warranting them to undertake that they should be done. And therefore such wonderful Things were not done upon every occasion, when perhaps the Wisdom of Man would have called for them, but only when it seemed good to the unerring Wisdom of God.

Miracles flourished in the Church in the Apostles Days, but yet even then they were under the Restraint of the Divine Pleasure. St. *Peter* was once delivered out of Prison by a Miracle; But St. *Paul* more than once used his Prudence to gain his Liberty, and to save himself. In particular the *Gift of Healing* flourished in the Church in those Days, and yet St. *Paul* advised *Timothy* to drink a (*w*) *little Wine for his Stomachs sake, and his often Infirmities*; yet also he (*x*) *left Trophimus sick at Miletum.*

(*w*) 1 Tim. v. 23.
(*x*) 2 Tim. iv. 20.

I say then that the *Prayer of Faith* always prevailed; that when the Presbyters anointed the Sick with Oil, and asked his Health in the Name of *Christ*, they were assured of the Event; that the sick Person at that time was healed, and that the Lord raised him up; but that they asked not this in behalf of the Sick, without the guidance of the Divine Spirit by which they were acted. And therefore *Bellarmin* might have spared that Scruple; that very few Believers must have died in the Apostles Days, if the Unction and the Prayer of Faith is to be referred to the recovery of Bodily Health.

2. That other Clause, *If he has committed Sins, they shall be forgiven him*, is a Promise made upon Sup-

Suppoſition of a Caſe, which did not always happen in the uſe of Anointing the Sick. Now I am yet to underſtand why the Apoſtle ſhould make a Suppoſition of ſuch a ſpecial Caſe as that of the Anointed Perſon's having *committed Sins*, if Unction was preſcribed as a Sacrament for the Remiſſion of Sins? For the Suppoſition taken with the reſt of the period, plainly enough implies, a Direction to anoint the ſick Perſon for whom the *Prayer of Faith* was made, whether he had committed Sins or not; only *if he had committed Sins, they ſhould be forgiven him.* Whatever St. *James* means here by *having committed Sins*, it is yet evident that this was not the Caſe of all that were anointed; and therefore whatever is meant alſo by the *Forgiveneſs of Sins* in this place, neither was this promiſed to all that were anointed; which ſeems to be a ſhrewd Argument that he did not preſcribe Unction as a Sacrament for the Remiſſion of Sins: Eſpecially if it be conſidered that the Caſe of all that were anointed was this, that they were Sick, and that the Promiſe abſolutely made to all that were anointed, was the Recovery of their Health; for this ſhews as clearly on the other ſide, that St. *James*'s Unction was the Ceremony of a miraculous Cure of the Body. Surely if we are to gather the meaning of this Rite from the Words of the Text where it was preſcribed, we are rather to refer it to that Effect which the Apoſtle tells us would certainly and always follow, *viz.* the *Recovery of Health*; than to that which would never follow, but in a ſpecial Caſe, *viz.* the *Forgiveneſs of Sins.* And 'tis certain that St. *James* makes the conſtant Effect of his Unction to be the Recovery of Bodily Health; and he aſſures

us

us that ſometimes the Forgiveneſs of Sins would follow. We therefore ſay that his Unction was properly a Rite of the Gift of Healing, and thus it always ſignified ſomething. But our Adverſaries will needs have it, that his Unction was a Sacrament, and that the proper end of it was Remiſſion of Sins, and that the Recovery of Bodily Health was a Thing by the Bye, which fell out now and then, as it might be expedient: *i.e.* They will have the Apoſtle to promiſe Bodily Health, as a Thing by the Bye, in Words that expreſs an abſolute Promiſe of it; and they will have him promiſe Forgiveneſs of Sins to all upon the due uſe of Unction, in Words that manifeſtly ſuppoſe that he promiſes it but to ſome only; and conſequently that he eſtabliſhed an Unction which would always be a Sacrament, and yet ſometimes would be no Sacrament at all.

I think therefore that I may conclude, For any Man to make anointing the Sick to be a conſtant Means and Sign of that Grace which could not take place in many of thoſe who were qualified for Unction, and were duly anointed according to the Direction of the Apoſtle, is to make the Apoſtle talk very vainly, that himſelf might not ſeem to do ſo: And not to make that to be the end and meaning of his Unction which took place in all that were anointed, is to make the Apoſtle mean what we liſt, and not what his Words mean.

If indeed St. *James* had ſaid, *Is any ſick among you? Let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oil in the Name of the Lord, and his Sins ſhall be forgiven him; and if it be expedient for the good of his Soul, the Prayer of Faith ſhall alſo ſave the Sick, and the Lord*

ſhall

ſhall raiſe him up. Had it been thus, I ſay, I would know if our Adverſaries would not have exclaimed againſt us as the moſt obſtinate Perſons in the World, if we had either denied forgiveneſs of Sins, or affirmed the recovery of Bodily Health, to be the true and proper end of that Unction whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaks. But now his Words are quite otherwiſe, for on the other ſide, the promiſe of Bodily Health is abſolute, and belongs to all that are anointed; and that of forgiveneſs of Sins is conditional, and belongs only to thoſe who have committed Sins. Let our Adverſaries therefore judg impartially for once; and if they do, then I am ſure they will reaſon againſt their own Senſe of this place from the Apoſtles Words as they now ſtand; as they would have argued againſt ours, if they had ſtood as fairly for them as they do for us.

But to ſee how any thing will ſerve for an Argument in a deſperate Caſe. *Bellarmin* would make us believe, that theſe very Words, *And if he have committed Sins they ſhall be forgiven him*, do ſo clearly bring the Text on their ſide, that there is no room for Evaſion. For *theſe Words*, ſays he, *expreſly refer to the Soul, but the Gift of Healing belongs to the Body.* A wonderful Reaſon ſurely! But muſt not the Apoſtle ſpeak of a Spiritual Effect which in one Caſe is conſequent upon Unction of the Sick, but it muſt always be the thing ſignified and intended by it, and this tho he manifeſtly ſuppoſes that the Spiritual Effect *is not*, and plainly tells us what *is* the *conſtant* Signification and Effect of it? When Men of parts take invincible Arguments againſt their own Opinion, and pretend that they are unanſwerable Proofs for it, what ſhall a Man ſay to it, but that they labour under invincible Prejudice, or ſomething that is a great deal worſe?

Bell. de Extr. Unct. c. iii. §. *Quinto: Et ſi in peccatis*, &c.

It

It appears already from that paſſage concerning *Forgiveneſs of ſins*, that the Anointing in St. *James* was properly a Rite that referred to the Gift of Healing: And this will farther appear by conſidering what muſt be the ſenſe of thoſe words, *And if he have committed ſins they ſhall be forgiven him.*

It may ſeem ſtrange, that the Apoſtle ſhould make the anointed perſons, having committed ſins, the matter of a ſuppoſition, as if ſome that were to be anointed, had committed no ſins at all. But now, becauſe, without all Queſtion, neither was the Apoſtles ſuppoſition vain and idle, nor is it true of any mere Man, that he never ſinned; therefore by *committing ſins*, the Apoſtle did not mean ſimply and abſolutely *having ſinned*; but with reference to that matter only whereof he was then ſpeaking, *viz.* that bodily ſickneſs which was to be removed by the Gift of Healing. So that the meaning muſt neceſſarily be this, *And if he has committed ſuch ſins as it pleaſed God to puniſh by viſiting him with ſickneſs, they ſhall be forgiven him.* Beſides thoſe places where *committing* and *not committing ſin*, are to be underſtood with ſome qualification, ſuch as that, [y] *He that committeth ſin is of the Devil. And whoſoever is born of God doth not commit ſin, and he cannot ſin, becauſe he is born of God:* There is one ſaying of our Saviour, that requires the ſame Interpretation with this paſſage in St. *James*. [z] When *his Diſciples asked him, Maſter, who did ſin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Jeſus anſwered, Neither hath this man ſinned, nor his parents*, i. e. It was for no ſin, either of him or his Parents, that he was born blind, *but that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him.* In like manner the ſuppoſition of the ſick Man's having committed ſins, is to be limited by reference

[y] 1 Joh. iii. 8, 9.

[z] Joh. ix. 2, 3.

to the Caſe now diſcourſed of, that is, of his Sickneſs. For whether it came in the ordinary and natural courſe of things, or whether God ſent it for the trial of his patience aud ſubmiſſion, *the Prayer of Faith ſhould ſave the ſick*; or if it were inflicted as a puniſhment, and for his Correction, God would releaſe him of the puniſhment, and *raiſe him up*, and *his ſins ſhould be forgiven.*

It is not perhaps unfit to remember in this place, that in the beginning of the Church, it pleas'd God to inflict bodily Diſeaſes upon many Chriſtians that had grievouſly offended in any kind, and this not only in purſuance of Church Cenſures, but ſometimes without them: which was the Caſe of thoſe in the Church of *Corinth*, who for their unworthy behaviour at their Aſſemblies for Celebrating the Holy Communion, were
1 Cor. 11. 30. viſited with Gods hand. For ſaith St. *Paul*, *For this cauſe many are weak and ſickly among you, and many ſleep.* *i. e.* Many are dead of thoſe Sickneſſes which God ſent to chaſtiſe you for that great fault that reigned amongſt you, and many of you remain under thoſe Sickneſſes ſtill, being not yet humbled under the mighty hand of
V. 31. God. *If we would judge our ſelves we ſhould not be judged*, i. e. By care to do our duty, we ſhould prevent Gods Chaſtiſements, but if upon neglecting our ſelves
V. 32. we *are chaſtned by the Lord*, it is, *that we ſhould not be condemned with the World.* For God did not ſtrike them with ſudden Death, but with ſome ſudden Sickneſs, and gave them time to repent, to confeſs their fault, and to ſatisfy the Church.

Now altho it was the congruity of this place to the paſſage in St. *James*, concerning the ſuppoſition of *having committed ſins*, that led me to interpret the one by the other; yet upon farther inquiry, I found the notion

notion not to be altogether deſtitute of Antiquity. For Venerable *Bede*, in his Notes upon this Clauſe, applies St. *Paul*'s Text to it in this manner. * *Many for ſins done by the Soul, are puniſhed with the ſickneſs, or with the death alſo of the Body. Whence it is, that the Apoſtle ſaith to the* Corinthians, *who were wont to receive the Lords Body unworthily*, For this cauſe many among you are ſick and weak, and many ſleep. *If therefore the ſick are under the guilt of ſins, and ſhall confeſs them to the Preſbyters of the Church, and ſhall make it their buſineſs, to forſake and amend them, with a perfect heart, they ſhall be forgiven them.* And then he goes on ſhewing, That ſins of the greater ſort had need to be confeſſed in order to this end. || *Amalarius* alſo delivers the very ſame interpretation in the account he gives of the Unction of the ſick in his days; as I ſhall have farther occaſion to obſerve in a more proper place.

* Bed. in loc. Tom. 5.

|| De Eccleſ. Offic. lib. 1. c. 12. Tom. 10. B. P.

So that beſides the reaſon of the thing, we have ſome Authority too, to interpret this place as I have done; *viz.* That thoſe words, *And if he has committed ſins*, are to be referred to ſuch Caſes as that which St. *Paul* diſcourſes of; where the Sickneſs was inflicted for the puniſhment of ſome notable and ſcandalous fault; not excluding thoſe inſtances of ſuch puniſhment for ſins ſecretly committed: But for whatever ſin the ſickneſs was ſent, it ſhould be forgiven, and God would ſhew, that he had received the ſick perſon into favour again, by taking off his ſickneſs: For *in this caſe alſo*, the Prayer of Faith ſhould ſave the ſick. Thus our Saviour demonſtrated the Truth of that ſaying to the Man ſick of the (*a*) *Palſie*, *Son be of good cheer thy ſins be forgiven thee*, by adding, *Ariſe, take up thy bed and go unto thy houſe*, and by that miraculous Cure that followed. Thus after he had healed the

(*a*) Matt. ix. 2, 6, 7.

diſeaſed Man at the Pool of *Betheſda*, he ſaid unto him, (*b*) *Behold, thou art made whole, ſin no more, leſt a worſe thing come unto thee*; plainly intimating, that his infirmity was the puniſhment of ſome ſin that he had been guilty of, which was now forgiven, becauſe he was made whole, and ſhould be dealt with hereafter, not according to what he had been, but as he ſhould behave himſelf for the time to come. In like manner, and with like expreſſion, St. *James* does promiſe, That upon the *Prayer of Faith*, the Gift of Healing ſhould take place, even where the Diſeaſe was inflicted for the puniſhment of ſins. Which conſtruction of the place is ſo natural and agreeable, that I ſhall purſue the illuſtration of this paſſage no longer, but leave the Reader to judge of it by what has been ſaid already.

[b] Joh. v. 14.

SECT. VI.

That our Interpretation of the uſe of Anointing in St. James, *and not our Adverſaries, is favoured by the following paſſages to the end of his Epiſtle.*

THE third way of inquiry was, to ſee what light is given to the meaning of St. *James*'s Unction, by thoſe following paſſages that are in connexion with the place under debate.

1. The very next words that follow, are theſe, *Confeſs your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that you may be healed.* But whether by praying one for another in this Verſe, be meant *the Prayer of Faith* in the former Verſe, which referred to the Gift of Healing, and was accompanied with a perſuaſion, that God would raiſe up the ſick; or only praying, that God would raiſe him up, when they had no abſolute perſuaſion

ſuaſion that ſo it would be; is what I dare not poſitively ſay, having no clear reaſon to determine me one way or other. But in which ſenſe ſoever the words be taken, as they muſt be in one of them, they ſeem to have a very reaſonable connexion with what went before; and either way this Exhortation is to be referred to that ſpecial Caſe mentioned juſt before; *And if he has committed ſins they ſhall be forgiven him.*

If the *Prayer of Faith* is here meant (as I think it is) then St. *James* exhorts the ſick perſon, whom God had viſited for his ſins, to humble himſelf and give glory to God, by confeſſing to the Elders thoſe ſins which lay upon his Conſcience; and likewiſe intimates, that the *gift of healing* would not otherwiſe take place in his Caſe; and therefore he was firſt to confeſs, and then the Elders to pray over him. As for Anointing with Oil, it was enough that the Apoſtle mentioned that before; it being a Ceremony, which (or ſome other of like ſignification) was cuſtomarily uſed in the Church upon Healing by a miraculous Gift. The main matters are thoſe which he urges here, Confeſſion and Repentance on the part of the ſick Man; and then the Prayer of the Elders on his behalf, which would certainly prevail for his recovery no leſs than in any other Caſe, if it was the Prayer of Faith mentioned before.

But if the Prayer here ſpoken of were not the Prayer proceeding from a perſuaſion that the ſick would be healed, but the ordinary Prayer of the Faithful one for another, imploring the recovery of the ſick perſon, if it ſhould ſeem good to God; then this Exhortation may well be conceived to run thus; "But "whether the Elders be inſtructed by the ſpirit, that "the Gift of Healing is, in the Caſe laſt mentioned, to "take place, or no; yet let the ſick perſon confeſs his "faults,

"faults, and then let the Elders pray for him, that he "may be healed, which God may be pleaſed to grant, "though not in the way of demonſtrating that extra- "ordinary Gift of Healing, which is ſo frequently ſeen "in the Church. And if this be the meaning, no wonder that there is no mention here of Anointing with Oil, which was a Ceremony proper to that Gift.

But let the meaning be this or that, we have this advantage from the place, that the effect of Confeſſion and Prayer here expreſſed, is no other than that the perſon might be *healed*, *i. e.* recover his bodily health; which is a farther Confirmation, that St. *James* had not before directed to the uſe of a Sacrament for the Soul; but to the uſe of that Gift then flouriſhing in the Church, which was for the ſaving of the Body; though that alſo was deſigned for the good of Souls, as indeed all other miraculous operations were, and all the gifts of God whatſoever. And this is ſo great an advantage in favour of our Concluſion, concerning the intent of St. *James*'s Unction in the former Verſe, that here alſo our Adverſaries do find it neceſſary to pervert the meaning of thoſe plain words, *that ye may be healed*, and to interpret them of the delivering of *the Soul* from ſin; as *Eſtius* does in particular, and that upon no other ground, but becauſe *Health in the Scriptures is often referred to the Soul.* But concerning the extravagance of this interpretation, I have ſpoken already, §. 2.

Eſt. in loc.

2. It follows. *The effectual fervent Prayer of a Righteous Man availeth much*, i. e. it availeth ſometimes to the producing of ſtrange and ſudden effects, (as the example of *Elias* ſhews, which is immediately added): which is a good argument to back the foregoing Exhortation of confeſſing to one another, and praying one

one for another, ſuppoſing that thoſe Prayers of good Men are to be underſtood, which are grounded upon the general promiſes of God only. But to me it ſeems more probable, that *the Prayer of Faith* is ſtill meant, becauſe of the inſtance of *Elias* his Prayer, by which the Apoſtle does preſently illuſtrate his meaning. And to this notion the Greek word, which we tranſlate *Effectual fervent*, is very favourable; becauſe it aptly ſignifies that incitation and impulſe of the Holy Spirit, which operates *the Prayer of Faith*. But altho this ſenſe appears reaſonable, I will not ſtand upon it, if equal reaſon can be given for another. It will be ſufficient to my purpoſe to obſerve, That altho the prevalency of a good mans Prayer is here affirmed in general terms; and tho without all queſtion ſuch a Mans earneſt Prayer is very forcible for the obtaining of ſpiritual benefits, which is the beſt force they have; yet the Caſe of which he ſpake juſt before [*that ye may be healed*] limits his meaning of that power of Prayer which he ſpeaks of here, to that of producing temporal effects. Which limitation is required no leſs by that which follows. Ἐνεργουμένη ἐσχυρά.

3. Elias *was a man ſubject to like paſſions as we are, and he prayed earneſtly that it might not rain, and it rained not on the earth by the ſpace of three years and three months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.* Now that both in the one Caſe and in the other, the Prayer of *Elias* was the *Prayer of Faith*, in the ſenſe ſo often already mentioned, cannot juſtly be queſtioned; for as we know from St. *James*, that he prayed that it might not rain, and again that it might rain; ſo we know by the Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament, that he expreſly and abſolutely foretold to *Ahab*, both the * one and the ‖ other. And it.

* 1 Ki xviii. 1.
‖ xvii. 41, &c.

it is evident, that this is an inſtance of the power of Prayer to produce temporal effects of a ſurpriſing and wonderful nature; which makes the inſtance pertinent to what he had been ſpeaking of before. Nor is it incongruous to obſerve, That as the withholding of rain for ſo long time upon *Elias* his Prayer, does in part anſwer the Caſe of a Sinners being ſmitten with ſickneſs for his tranſgreſſion; ſo the ſending of rain upon the Prayer of *Elias*, does fully anſwer the Caſe of the ſick Mans recovery, by means of the Prayer of Faith.

And now I may appeal to the Judicious Reader, whether our Adverſaries making St. *James*'s Unction to be a Sacrament for the immediate benefit of the Soul, does not imply it to be brought in without any coherence or pertinence to thoſe paſſages which lie about it; and whether there be not a clearly pertinent Connexion from one end to the other, ſuppoſing it to be mentioned as a Ceremony of the Gift of Healing.

As for their referring all to the Soul, that is here ſaid with reference to Anointing, it carries indeed a ſhow of Piety; and but a ſhow, unleſs it were a pious thing to found a Doctrine upon a place of Scripture that will not bear it. What they ſay to this purpoſe is very true, but 'tis not the meaning of the Text. Their fault is, that they introduce it in the wrong place: But if they would be content to bring it in, where St. *James* brings it in, they had both kept to the true interpretation of his words, and withal ſecured the obſervation of that moſt neceſſary Point, That how great temporal bleſſings ſoever we receive from God, they are not yet to be compared with our ſpiritual intereſts and our concerns in another Life.

4. For St. *James* having finiſhed his Diſcourſe concerning the Healing of the Sick, does immediately cloſe all

all with this inſtruction. *Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, Let him know, that he who converteth the Sinner from the errour of his way, ſhall ſave a ſoul from death, and ſhall hide a multitude of ſins.* As if he had ſaid, "After all, when any Chriſtian does "by wicked practiſe depart from the truth which he pro- "feſſes, and one of his Brethren, by charitable admoniti- "ons, and by earneſt Prayers to God for him, brings him "into the way of his duty again; let him know, that this "is an infinitely better work, than to recover the ſick, "tho by the Gift of Healing, which of it ſelf extend- "eth no farther than to a temporal benefit. For he "that brings a Sinner to repentance, is a means to ſave "that Mans Soul, and ſhall himſelf find mercy from "God for this Charity to his Brother, more than if he "had wrought never ſo many miraculous Cures upon "the Bodies of the ſick.

And thus I have ſhewn, That the parallel place in St. *Mark*, that the Text it ſelf, and the Context, do all of them lead to one and the ſame interpretation of St. *James*'s Unction, *viz.* That it was a Ceremony of the Gift of Healing; which is ſufficient to overthrow all pretence for eſtabliſhing a Sacrament of Extreme Unction upon the Authority of the Scripture.

SECT. VII.

Objections againſt our Interpretation anſwered.

WE may now allow our Adverſaries to pleaſe themſelves with fanſying, that they find * all that belongs to a Sacrament in the words of St. *James*; ſo long as it appears, that his Unction was a Rite of the Gift of Healing. Nor will any Man be in danger

* Hic habemus omnia, &c. Bell. de Extr. Unct. cap. 11.

of believing, that here is an Inſtitution of a Rite to be uſed in all Ages of the Church, becauſe as *Bellarmine* argues, 'tis ſaid, *Is any ſick among you?* From whence he concludes, that 'tis to continue in the Church as long as ſick perſons are to be found in it; For ſtill there muſt be another thing found in the Church too, *viz.* the ſupernatural Gift of Healing the ſick, or elſe the reaſon of St. *James*'s Unction does not continue. And yet if that Gift were ſtill continued, the Rite of it would be no Sacrament neither; becauſe Sacraments do properly, and in their own nature, refer to the Soul, and but by accident to the Body.

Nothing therefore remains, for the clearing of our Interpretation, but to conſider thoſe Objections againſt it, which have not yet been anſwered.

Bell. de Extr. Unct. cap. iii. §. *Quod autem*, &c.

1. 'Tis ſaid, that if *miraculous* Cures were here intended, St. *James* had conſulted, not only for the *ſick*, but for *the blind alſo, the deaf, and the lame, who need Cure, though they are not in danger of death.* To which I anſwer, that the *Greek* word, and their own Vulgar *Latin* too, is of latitude enough to take in all ſorts of Bodily Infirmities. But if there are probable reaſons, and particularly the expreſſion || in St. *Mark* to reſtrain the word to *ſickneſs*, I would gladly know, why St. *James* muſt neceſſarily adviſe the blind and the lame, becauſe he adviſes the ſick to be anointed with Oil in the name of the Lord. St. *Paul* diſtinguiſhes between the *Gifts of Healing*, and between the *working of miracles*; the latter ſeeming to ſignify the Curing of the *blind* and the *lame*, and the raiſing of the *Dead*, as the former ſignifies recovering the ſick. And what neceſſity is there, that St. *James* when he ſpeaks of one Caſe, muſt ſpeak of the other too? Or that he muſt ſpeak of both or neither? Why, the one *needs Cure* as well as the

* Ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; Infirmatur quis in vobis?

|| Ἥλειφον πολλοὺς ἀῤῥώστους.

1 Cor. xii. 9, 10.

the other. Well, but what if the Apoſtle does not ſpeak of all that need Cure, but only of ſome, that is, of *the ſick?* So that this objection comes to nothing, unleſs it were an unreaſonable thing to give proper advice to thoſe, who by reaſon of ſickneſs are in ſome danger of Death, which alſo is a very ordinary Caſe; though ſuch advice ſhould not be altogether ſo proper for thoſe few in compariſon, who being *lame*, or *blind*, *need Cure* indeed, but *are not in that danger.*

2. It is alſo objected, that if the miraculous Gift of Healing were here intended, St. *James* had required the ſick to call for *thoſe that were endued with that Gift, rather than for the Elders*, ſince others would ſerve for this purpoſe no leſs than they. To which it is ſufficient to ſay, That if this Gift was no leſs amongſt the Elders, than amongſt Lay-Chriſtians, it was reaſonably adviſed to ſend for the Elders, who had the Gift which others had, and that Authority which others had not, and withal ſome degree of knowledge in ſpiritual things, which was not common to all. Bellar. c. iii. §. *Secundo: Inducat*, &c.

3. It is again objected, That if the miraculous Gift were here to be underſtood, Oil had not been preſcribed, becauſe the *power of miracles* was exerted freely, and *not tied* to any ſuch condition as that. *Anſ.* We ſay alſo, that it was not *tied* to it, it being certain, that the Apoſtles healed ſome without it. But it was a ſufficient ground for St. *James* to direct anointing in this place, that it was the uſual Rite that went along with the Exerciſe of the Gift of Healing, as St. *Mark*'s Text ſtrongly intimates [§. 4.] And becauſe the Gift was ſometimes exerted without the Ceremony, we have reaſon to think, that St. *James* does not preſcribe the Ceremony as a thing neceſſary, but rather mentions it as a thing cuſtomary; not as that upon which Ibid. §. *Tertio: Orent*, &c.

the Healing depended, but with which, when it was convenient, it was wont to be grac'd.

[r] Ibid. *Sexto*; *Omnia alia*, &c.

4. We are told, that ſince all other directions in this Epiſtle belong to us, no leſs than to the faithful in the Apoſtles days, therefore this muſt do ſo too; and therefore it is not to be underſtood of the Gift of Healing which is of long diſcontinuance, but of a Sacrament that is to continue always in the Church. Which is as much as to ſay, That becauſe the main deſign of the Apoſtolical Epiſtles was to inculcate duties to which the Church is equally obliged in all Ages, therefore they never laid down any Rules peculiar to the State of the Church in their own times, when it flouriſhed with ſupernatural Gifts. Which is ſo groſs a falſhood, that becauſe thoſe of our Communion read the Scriptures, they cannot be impoſed upon by it.

I know no other Objections but what have been anſwered in ſome part of the foregoing Diſcourſe: Unleſs this be one, That the Fathers of *Trent* have thought fit to fix an *Anathema* upon all that diſſent from them in this Point. For how ſhort ſoever they were in proving their Doctrine, yet they have been very careful and particular in *Curſing* thoſe that gain-ſay it, as theſe Canons will witneſs for them.

Seſſ. 14.

I. "If any one ſhall ſay, that Extreme Unction is "not truly and properly a Sacrament inſtituted by our "Lord *Chriſt*, and publiſhed by the Bleſſed Apoſtle St. "*James*, but only a Rite received from the Fathers, or "an Human Invention, let him be *Anathema*.

II. "If any one ſhall ſay, that the Sacred Unction of "the ſick, does not confer Grace, nor remit Sins, nor "comfort the ſick, but has now ceaſed, as if heretofore "it were only the Gift of Healing, let him be *Ana-*"*thema*.

III. "If

III. "If any one ſhall ſay, that the Rite and Uſage "of Extreme Unction, which the Holy *Roman* Church "obſerves, is repugnant to the ſenſe of St. *James* the "Apoſtle, and is therefore to be changed, and may "juſtly, and without ſin, be contemned by Chriſtians, "let him be *Anathema.*

But after all this Curſing, if their arguing for Extreme Unction may be *contemned without ſin*, ſo may their *Anathema*'s too; and we may comfort our ſelves with *David*'s Prayer: *Let them Curſe, but Bleſs thou.*

SECT. VIII.

That St. James's *Text affords uſeful admonitions, though it is far from eſtabliſhing a Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*

ONE of *Bellarmine*'s Objections was this, That according to our Interpretation of the Text in St. *James*, *it belongs not to us*, he meant, That it would be impertinent in us to anoint the ſick with Oil, becauſe the Gift of ſupernatural Healing is hardly to be found. But his expreſſion was a little too large in ſaying, That *theſe things* therefore *would not belong to us.* For thoſe things may be ſaid to belong to us from whence we may reap very good Inſtruction, as certainly we may from *theſe.* This paſſage concerning ſo notable a Gift, as that of Healing was, is one of thoſe that make up the Teſtimony which God gave to the Chriſtian Religion in the early days of the Church, and *it belongs to us* to take notice of them all, for the ſtrengthning of our Faith. And there are many good inſtructions beſides which this place affords, that will be uſeful to the Worlds end. And therefore I ſhall cloſe this part with repreſenting what they are.

1. Is

1. Is any Man ſick? he ought to take his ſickneſs as coming from the hand of God, though perhaps not ſo immediately as ſickneſs was ſometimes inflicted upon *Chriſtians* in the Primitive Church. He ſhould conſider with himſelf, that this is one of the ordinary trials of a Mans Faith and Patience, and that he is therefore exceedingly to blame if he does not bear it as a Chriſtian ought to do. Or he is to reflect, whether it be not for ſome ſin yet unrepented of, that God in his goodneſs hath thought fit to give him this warning; that he may make his ſickneſs the beginning of his repentance.

2. As a Member of the Church which is *the Body of Chriſt*, he is alſo to ſend for Gods Miniſter in the Church, that he may receive the benefit of his inſtructions: To which end the beſt courſe he can take is, to confeſs his fault, and to lay open the grief of his mind, ſince the Miniſter will thereby be better enabled to make ſuch applications to his Caſe, as may be effectual to procure his amendment for the future, and his comfort at preſent; and the ſick perſon be in leſs danger of letting himſelf looſe to ſelf-flattery and preſumption, or of being over-whelmed with too much Grief. It is not to be thought that the Elders were ſent for in the Primitive Church merely for the Gift of Healing, for that did not always take place, but for the benefit alſo of ſpiritual inſtruction and conſolation which always did.

3. As a means for the recovery of his Health, the ſick perſon is to deſire the Prayers of the Miniſter. For tho we cannot with any modeſty pretend to *the Prayer of Faith* here mentioned, that is, of a certain perſuaſion, that the perſon for whom we pray ſhall be raiſed up; yet we ought to pray in this Faith, that it is pleaſing

to

to God when we expreſs our dependence upon him * by asking thoſe things which we need; that every good thing comes from him, and therefore health and deliverance from Death; that tho he does not always give that particular thing which we ask, yet 'tis ſometimes denied becauſe we do not ask; and that as he never gives the greateſt bleſſings of all, which are thoſe of a good mind, but in anſwer to Prayers; ſo ſometimes he does not ſend bodily good things, becauſe he is not prayed to for them: Finally, That there is no leſs reaſon for Prayer when God raiſeth up the ſick, by bleſſing ordinary means, than when it was done by a ſupernatural Gift. * Phil. iv. 6.

The diſcontinuance of the Gift of Healing has not ſo altered the Caſe, but that God as truly forgives the ſins of the penitent ſick Man, in reſtoring him to health now, as he did then when a Miracle was ſeen in the recovery; and the Prayers of the Elders of the Church are now to be deſired for the one, no leſs than they were heretofore for the other; eſpecially ſince even in thoſe times they did not always pray one for another, with aſſurance to obtain the thing they asked, and the event was to declare, whether God ſaw it expedient to grant their requeſts. But,

4. In this Caſe Men are not to do according to the common Cuſtom, of not calling for the Prieſt till there is little or no hope of Life left, and when his Prayers for the recovery of the Patient are almoſt as inſignificant, as it would be to *anoint him with Oil in the Name of the Lord*; when he is drawing on to the laſt gaſp, and nothing indeed but a Miracle can raiſe him up. The Apoſtle does not ſay, Is any Man ſick *unto Death?* but, *is any man ſick?* which ſeems to imply an advice to call for the Elders of the Church before the Diſeaſe

was

was grown deſperate according to the natural courſe of things, and not to truſt to be Cured by a Miracle at laſt, when it was apparent that nothing but a Miracle could do it. It is now much more requiſite that the Prieſt ſhould be called for when the danger firſt begins to appear, becauſe Miracles are ceas'd. And as for them that try the Phyſician till he gives them over, and never till then ſeek the Prayers of the Church, they have but little reaſon to hope for help from God, to whom they have no recourſe till they are driven by the laſt extremity. For they ſhew, that if they could have had relief without him, they cared not to be beholden to him for it. In which Caſe it is juſt with God, to ſuffer the ſickneſs to be mortal, which perhaps had not been ſo, if applications had been made to him with the firſt, by calling for the Elders, by confeſſing their ſins, by promiſing repentance, and by Prayers for good things requiſite, as well for the Body as the Soul.

Such admonitions as theſe we may gather from this place of Scripture; tho we do neither ſuppoſe it pertinent to anoint *ſick* perſons with Oil, as they did in the *Apoſtolical* times, unleſs we had the Gift of Healing, which flouriſhed in thoſe times; nor account it any part of our duty to anoint *dying* perſons with Oil, as they now do in the Church of *Rome*, unleſs we believed what they ſay they believe, That it was a Sacrament inſtituted by *Chriſt*, inſinuated by St. *Mark*, and publiſhed by St. *James*, to confer grace and take away ſins.

But it has been ſhewn, that they give us no manner of good reaſon to believe any ſuch thing, either out of St. *Mark*, or St. *James*; but that there is very good reaſon to believe the contrary from both thoſe Authorities. And ſo much for their pretended Arguments out of Scripture.

OF

OF EXTREME UNCTION.

PART II.

That it is a late Innovation, and has no ground in Antiquity.

SECT. I.

What anointings were uſed in the Antient Church.

SInce there are no Sacraments properly ſo called, but thoſe, the Inſtitution whereof is delivered to us in the Holy Scriptures; we need not be ſollicitous concerning the Teſtimony of the Antient Church, after the Age of the Apoſtles: Not ſo much, at leaſt, for the ſake of Truth, as for the Honour of the Antient Chriſtians, from whom our Adverſaries pretend to have received this their Sacrament of Extreme Unction. But if any there be who conceive the Truth not to be ſo evident, but that it will bear an Addition of light and ſtrength from Antient Teſtimony, we are far from envying them this means of ſatisfaction.

Whereas therefore (*a*) *Bellarmin* appeals to the *Tradition*

(*a*) De Extr. Unct. cap. iv.

dition of the Ancients; I make no queſtion but it will appear, that this pretended Sacrament was unknown to the Church for above a thouſand years; that his inſtances to the Contrary are far from being proofs, and that ſome of them, in which he places his greateſt confidence, are againſt him.

But for more clear proceeding; In the firſt place we make no difficulty to grant, That there were ſeveral Anointings uſed in the Ancient Church, and thoſe too as ſo many Religious Rites: But withal we ſay, that the Unction of the ſick, now in faſhion amongſt the pretended *Catholics*, was none of them.

Anciently they anointed the (*b*) *Catechumens* that were ready for Baptiſm, and this with ſimple Oil; and (*c*) after Baptiſm they anointed them with *Chriſm*, or a compounded Oil, which cuſtom was very plentifully atteſted by Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as every one knows, that is in any degree converſant with them. Some plain Teſtimonies to this purpoſe, I have referred to in the Margin; and that becauſe I ſhall ere-long have occaſion to remember, That this uſage, tho it was the matter of no Divine Precept, was frequently remembred by the Ancients.

(*b*) Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. iii. c. 16. lib. vii. c. 42, 44.

(*c*) Tertull. de Bapt. c. x. Cypr. Ep. 70. Oxon. Syn. Arauſic. I. Can. 2. Reſp. ad Orthod. Qu. 137. Hieron. Tom. iv. Com. in Lam. c. 11. Dionyſ. Areop. de Eccl. Hier. c. vii. §. 8. Vide etiam Cotelerii notas in Patr. Apoſt. p. 214.

They alſo anointed (*d*) thoſe who had been baptized by Hereticks, when they came over to the Communion of the Catholicks; and this with holy Ointment.

(*d*) Reſp. ad Orthod. Qu. 14. in Juſt. M.

Such Unctions as theſe were all of them far enough from this Anointing Myſtery of the *Roman* Church, becauſe they were not ſo much as Unctions of the *ſick*.

And yet I grant, that in the Ancient Church they did ſometimes anoint the ſick and infirm alſo. But then the inſtances of that Unction are by no means favour-

able

able to the pretended *Sacrament* of *Extreme* Unction; becauſe, altho they were ſick perſons who were anointed, yet it was not a Sacramental Unction to prepare the ſick for their paſſage out of this World, but a Rite of the Gift of Healing; the Gift of Healing, I ſay, which it pleaſed God to continue in the Church for ſome Ages after the Apoſtles.

Thus (e) *Tertullian* tells us, that *Proculus* a Chriſtian, the Procurator of one * *Euhoida*, was kindly entertained by *Severus* the Emperour, to the day of his Death, becauſe he *had once Cured him with Oil.* (f) St. *Hierom* alſo reports, that many Husbandmen and Shepherds, ſtung with Serpents and venomous Beaſts, ran to *Hilarion*, and were cured with holy Oil: And that the ſame *Hilarion* ſaved the Lives of *Conſtantia*'s Son-in-Law, and her Daughter, by anointing them with Oil. The like is affirmed by (g) *Sulpitius Severus*, of *Martin* Biſhop of *Tours*, that he Cured a Paralytick Maid by earneſt Prayer and by Oil. And (h) St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of a Maid of *Hippo*, that was diſpoſſeſſed of a Devil, by the Prayers of a Presbyter, and by anointing her ſelf with Oil, into which he had let fall his tears. Several inſtances of this kind are to be met with in (i) *Roſweid*, which I paſs over to avoid tediouſneſs. I ſhall only add, that the ſeventh Age was not without the Gift of Healing, and that the uſe of Unction which referred to it, was till then continued, as appears by what (k) *Bede* reports of *Cuthbert* Biſhop of *Fern-Iſle*, who died when *Bede* was about twenty years old. He tells us of a Holy Woman that was vexed with an intolerable pain in her Head, and in one of her Sides, whom *Cuthbert*, after the Phyſicians had given her over, anointed with holy Oil; that from that time ſhe mended, and in a few days was perfectly well.

(e) Ad Scapulam cap. 4. * *Euodus.*

(f) De Vitâ Hilarionis, Tom. 1. p. 9. Colon.

(g) Vit. Mart. c. 15.

(h) De Civit. D. lib. 22. c. 8.

(i) Vitæ Patrum, p. 211, 343, 451, &c.

(k) Vitæ Cuthb. c. 30.

Vide Dallæum de Ext. Unctione, p 85, 86, 87. & Baron. A. C. 63. n. iv.

Now it muſt be granted, that ſo long as the ſupernatural Gift of Healing laſted, there was as much reaſon to uſe the common Ceremony of ſuch Healing as there was at firſt. And as we confeſs this practice of anointing the ſick to have been frequent in the firſt Ages of the Church, ſo we grant it to have been an Apoſtolical Tradition. For we find it agreeing with the practice of the Apoſtles in St. *Mark*, and with the Cuſtom of the Primitive Presbyters in St. *James*. But then altho this was the Unction of the ſick, yet it was not Extreme Unction, nor the Sacrament of the Dying. For the direct end for which it was adminiſtred, was, That thoſe who were anointed might not die, but recover their health by the ſupernatural Gift of God. And, as I ſhall ſhew preſently, this practice proves Antiquity to be as much againſt the *Roman* Sacrament, as St. *Mark* and St. *James* ſhew the Scripture to be ſo.

In the mean time I muſt obſerve, That there was yet another Unction in the Ancient Church, which ſeems to me to have been no otherwiſe a Religious Rite, than that it becomes *Chriſtians* eſpecially, who believe the Reſurrection of the Body, to interr their dead decently and honourably: For it ſeems they Anointed the Dead. So (*l*) *Clemens Alexandrinus* tells us. Nor was this to be wondered at in particular, ſince the *Jews* had uſed this Rite before, and the Chriſtians were remarkable for this, That they ſpared no coſt to adorn the Funerals of thoſe who died in the Lord, as (*m*) *Tertullian* told the Heathens. The Counterfeit (*n*) *Dionyſius* ſpeaks of it as of a general practice; he tells us, how the Prieſt having received the dead Body from the neareſt Relations, does all holy Rites that are Cuſtomary about thoſe that die in the Lord; that at length he ſalutes him that is dead, and that after him the reſt do

(*l*) Pædag. l. II. c. 8. p. 176. Par.

(*m*) Apolog. c. 42.

(*n*) De Hier. Eccleſ. cap. vii.

do ſo too; that then he pours Oil upon him, and after Prayers for All, that the Body is buried. But this I think makes nothing at all for the *Roman* Sacrament, though we ſhould take in that ſignification or inſtruction by which the laſt named Writer made this Unction of the Dead a kind of a Myſtery. (o) *Remember*, ſays he, *in the holy Regeneration by which one is Born of God, that before the Divine Baptiſm, the firſt participation of that Holy Rite*, viz. *the anointing with Oil, is given to him that is initiated, after he has quite put off his former garment. But now at the end of all, he that is departed this Life is anointed with Oil. Then indeed* (before Baptiſm) *the anointing with Oil called forth him that was initiated to a Holy Warfare; but now* (that he is dead) *the Oil that is poured upon him ſhews him that is departed out of this life to have fought in this warfare to the end.*

(o) Ibid. §. 8.

Now I grant this to be *Extreme* Unction; but then 'tis neither the Unction of the *Dying*, nor of the *Sick*, but of the *Dead*. And if the pretended Catholicks will conform to the Cuſtom of the Church in this Writers time, their Unction will not be ſo much as *Extreme* Unction, becauſe this is to come after it; And *Bellarmin*'s reaſon why their Unction is called *Extreme*, becauſe 'tis the laſt of all Unctions, will be quite out of Doors, ſince the Unction of the Dead, and not of the Dying, muſt be laſt of all.

'Tis true, that this *Dionyſius* mentions one Unction before Death; but 'tis as wide from the buſineſs of the *Roman* Sacrament, as that after it; for the *Roman* Sacrament is adminiſtred only to Baptized Perſons; but the Unction he ſpeaks of which goes before death, goes before Baptiſm too, and is that which we have ſpoken of already.

So much for the Antient Unctions of the Church, what

what they were; and that they do not make for our Adverſaries. Let us conſider a little, whether ſome of them do not favour us.

SECT. II.

That the Unction of the ſick in the Antient Church, confirms our Interpretation of St. Mark *and St.* James.

THE firſt which I ſhall reſume, is the Antient practice of anointing the *ſick* in the Ages next after the Apoſtles, which ſeems to be a Good Evidence of the Truth of that Interpretation of St. *James*, which makes his Unction of the Sick, a Rite of miraculous Healing. For this practice does of it ſelf ſhew, That in all probability the ancient Chriſtians thus underſtood it; becauſe they applied Unction to the ſick in order to the recovery of their health by ſupernatural means. For the forſaid Cures are all of them related as miraculous Cures.

And therefore *Chemnitius* had reaſon to ſay, That *the progreſs of this Unction clearly ſhews it to be no Sacrament. For, firſt*, ſays he, *the Apoſtles anointed the ſick with common Oil to heal them; then others began to add Benediction, and to Conſecrate the Oil; but yet they uſed it to the ſame end, for which the Apoſtles uſed it before*, viz. *To Cure the ſick miraculouſly, as it appears by the Miracles ſaid to be done with holy Oil, by St.* Martin *and many others*, &c. But *when at length Miracles were quite ceaſed, the Ceremony of anointing ſtill went on.* In ſhort, he makes the Sacrament of Extreme Unction to have grown from the continuance of the Rite, after the reaſon of it was at an end, and miraculous Cures were no longer done. For which concluſion we ſhall ſee a great deal of reaſon hereafter.

hereafter. But in the mean time we will consider *Bellarmin's* notable conjecture on the other side, concerning the miraculous Cures that were done with Oil. (*p*) *But*, says he, *That the Ceremony of anointing the sick, in the way of a Sacrament, arose out of that Unction which operated in the way of a Miracle*, Chemnitius *proves no otherwise than that himself so thinks. But we on the contrary do conjecture, that this progress of Oil came about another way; that is to say, because in the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, it often happen'd, that people were healed; some holy men began upon that occasion to use Oil out of the Sacrament; not that Oil which was blessed by the Bishop, in order to a Sacrament; but Oil sanctified by themselves simply with the sign of the Cross, to heal Diseases.* Thus the Cardinal argues.

(*p*) De Extr. Unct. cap. 6. §. *Quod vero*, &c.

Now if his conjecture be a good one, then by his own Confession, those frequent Relations which we meet with in the Ancients, of miraculous Cures by Oil, do acquaint us with an Unction very different from *Bellarmin's* Sacramental Unction; as of necessity it must be if the Sacramental Unction was the Mother of that. And by consequence, unless they can produce other testimonies from Antiquity for their Sacrament, they must not think to find it in the instances of those that were miraculously healed by Oil, since these are not instances of Extreme Unction; nor will any Man say they are, unless he be furnished with as bold a Face as * *Fevardentius* had, who without any scruple, makes *Hilarion's* Unctions to be Extreme, and the Miracles reported to follow thereupon, to be the effects of Extreme Unction; and like an honest Man tells us, That St. *Hierom* says so.

* Not. in Iren. lib. 1. c. 18.

But for *Bellarmin's* conjecture it self, which he opposes to that of *Chemnitius*, 'tis no better than excess of confidence opposed to plain reason. For this was *Chemnitius's*

nitius's ground, that all the Unction of the sick, which we meet with in the Antients, was for bodily Cures; and that Extreme Unction was never heard of till of late; which, if it be true, makes it highly reasonable to conclude, That *Extreme* Unction grew out of the *miraculous* one, and very absurd to say, that *this* grew from *that*, unless we could fansy the Daughter to be born before the Mother.

As for the like Case which *Bellarmin* produces in favour of his Conjecture, I can hardly grant him what he seems to allow to *Chemnitius*, that he thought himself to be in the right. *After this manner*; says he, *we see it was done in Water*; *Because in Baptism men were sometimes healed of their Bodily Infirmities, as* Augustin *testifies, and gives some Examples of the same: From thence many began to use water, blessed out of Baptism for the Cure of Diseases.* Ibid.

Now indeed if there had been as frequent and as early mention of this Extreme Unction in the Writings of the Antient Church, as there is of Baptism; and if the instances of Cures by Unction had been as rare as those of healing by Baptismal Water, the instance had been very laudable, and one Case would have given light to the other: But since neither the one nor the other is true, nothing could have been less to the purpose. Of Baptism there is no dispute, whether the Church, from the first, held it a Sacrament. Holy Water out of Baptism came in long after; and it is therefore very reasonable to judge, That it might grow out of the Sacrament of Baptism, altho the Bodily Cures, wrought by Baptismal Water, were but rarely heard of. But now of Cures wrought by Unction, there is plain testimony in the Scriptures themselves, and || frequent mention in Ecclesiastical Writers for several Ages; And we say, that

|| Spond. A.C. 63. N. iv.

of

of this pretended Sacramental Unction there was no mention, no not ſo much as any intimation, for ſeveral Ages; whilſt Bodily Cures by Oil went on abundantly. And therefore there is as much reaſon to derive the pretended Sacrament of Unction from the miraculous Unction, as to derive the uſe of Holy Water from the Water of Baptiſm; becauſe as Baptiſm was before the one, ſo the miraculous Unction was, and that too for a much longer time, before the other.

So that the Cardinal's illuſtration does him no manner of ſervice, but is as fit for our purpoſe as any that could be readily thought of. For there is no more diſpute between the Church of *Rome* and us, whether the Antients frequently mention that Unction that was applied for Bodily Cures, than whether they took notice of the Sacrament of Baptiſm one Age after another, and this from the very firſt. But that they expreſſed any the leaſt regard to ſuch an Unction as the *Roman* Sacrament is, we utterly deny. And therefore for the ſame reaſon, that Water bleſſed for Bodily Cures, ſprang from the Water of Baptiſm, which is a Sacrament; for the ſame reaſon, I ſay, we may conclude, That Extreme Unction, which is pretended to be a Sacrament, but is none, ſprang from the Unction which was for Bodily Cures, and which was not pretended to be a Sacrament.

But the main point to be obſerved in this place, is, That if in the Antient Church they ſtill anointed the ſick in order to a miraculous Cure, and never applied Unction as a Sacrament to prepare the Soul for its conflict with Death, and to purge away the Reliques of ſin; this is little leſs than a demonſtration, that they did not underſtand St. *James*, as ſpeaking of Sacramental, or Extreme Unction, but of that Unction which was to reſtore health to the Body.

I ſhall therefore proceed to ſhew, that Antiquity was wholly a ſtranger to the *Roman* myſtery of anointing the ſick; and the firſt thing I ſhall attempt to this purpoſe, is to anſwer thoſe few teſtimonies which our Adverſaries pretend to have on their ſide.

SECT. III.

That Extreme Unction has not the Teſtimony of any Antient Pope.

THE Cardinal undertakes to prove the Sacrament in Queſtion, by the *Teſtimonies of Popes, Councils, Fathers, and other Authors.* His Popes are *Innocent* I. and *Innocent* III. and no more. Certainly he does not begin as if he would do wonders out of Antiquity, when in the compaſs of twelve hundred years he could produce but two Popes for one of his Sacraments. For *Innocent* III. lived in the beginning of the thirteenth Century. And therefore how clearly ſoever he may atteſt this new *Roman* Sacrament, it was not ſo learnedly done to bring his Teſtimony under that head of (*q*) the *Tradition of the Antients*; nor ſo wiſely neither, becauſe tho he were ſo late a Pope, yet his Teſtimony is but a ſcurvy one, and fitter to be mentioned in general, as the Cardinal mentions it, than to be produced as I ſhall do in its place. But perhaps *Innocent* I. will make amends for all; ſo *Bellarmine* indeed was pleaſed to ſay of *his teſtimony, That it ought to ſuffice if there were none beſides it: ſince he was an Antient Author, and began to take the Chair in the Year* 402. *And he was a man learned, and holy, and wonderfully commended by* Auſtin, Hierom *and* Chryſoſtom. *The Epiſtle cited is certainly his: He ſays expreſly and clearly,*

(*q*) Ubi ſupra c. iv.

clearly, That this Unction is a Sacrament explain'd by St. James, *and is therefore not to be given to thoſe who are not capable of other Sacraments*, &c. *Nor did ever any of the Antients reprove him for teaching, that the Unction of the ſick is a Sacrament.* Here now is an Authority brought out with no little circumſtance, as if it were able to do the buſineſs alone; and to make it look more conſiderably, we are told, that *All Catholicks produce it*; and that *Chemnitius durſt not ſo much as name it.* But I rather gueſs, that if *Chemnitius* had it before him, he did not think it worth his while to anſwer it.

For my own part, if this place of *Innocent* I. were as clear and full for Extreme Unction, as it ſeems *all Catholicks* take it to be, I ſhould not be afraid to reject his Authority as inſufficient, ſince in the ſame Epiſtle he affirms moſt notorious and ſilly falſhoods; * for inſtance, that *in all* Italy, France, Spain, Africa, *and* Sicily, *and the interjacent Iſlands, no Churches were founded but by Prieſts that were ordained by St.* Peter, *or his Succeſſors*, and *that no Apoſtle preached in theſe Provinces but he*; and this, he ſays, *is manifeſt.* || He alſo makes it an Eccleſiaſtical *Tradition*, and *demonſtrable by moſt evident reaſon*, That Chriſtians were to faſt upon *Saturdays*; and he makes thoſe to be *mad* that did otherwiſe: whereas it was notorious, that the *Eaſtern* and *African* Churches did not faſt upon thoſe days, no nor all *Italy* neither; for St. *Ambroſe* and his Church of *Milan* did it not. Now what a Man ſays, whileſt he is in the humour of venting ſuch things as theſe, had need, either of good reaſon, or ſome better Authority than his own to make it paſs. For theſe reaſons ſome learned Men, in pure reſpect to the memory of *Innocentius*, conclude this firſt Epiſtle to *Decentius*, Biſhop of *Eugubium*,

* Innoc. Ep. 1. in Præfat.

|| Ibid. n. 4.

bium, to be none of his; which is all the Anſwer that (*ſ*) *Chamier* gives to that Teſtimony for Extreme Unction, which *Bellarmine* produces out of it. But (*t*) Mr. *Daillé* has brought together ſo many, and ſo likely Authorities to prove it a genuine Epiſtle of *Innocent*, that they ſeem to weigh more on the one ſide, than the Extravagancies of the Epiſtle do on the other.

(*ſ*) Panſtr. De Sacr. N. T. lib. iv. c. 21.
(*t*) De Exr. Unct. p. 99.

But by whomſoever it was written, and if all the reſt of it were as true as Goſpel, ſure I am, that in the intended paſſage there is nothing at all for the *Roman* Sacrament of Extreme Unction; as any indifferent Man may ſee by the paſſage it ſelf, which the Cardinal was wiſe enough not to produce as it is in the Epiſtle. In anſwer to ſome queſtions concerning Anointing, as to which *Decentius* thought thoſe words of St. *James*, *Is any man ſick*, &c. were fit to be conſider'd; *Innocentius*, whom he conſulted about it, makes this return; (*u*) *That the Text no doubt is to be underſtood of the Faithful that are ſick; who may be anointed with the Holy Oil of Chriſme, which being made by the Biſhop, it is lawful, not only for Prieſts, but for all Chriſtians to uſe it, by anointing in their own need, or in the need of any of their Friends. But for what is added, 'tis a needleſs doubt, whether a Biſhop may do that which is undoubtedly lawful for Presbyters. For Presbyters are therefore mentioned, becauſe Biſhops being hindred by other imployments, cannot go about to all ſick perſons. But if the Biſhop can, or thinks fit to viſit any one, he that*

(*u*) Quod non eſt Dubium de Fidelibus ægrotantibus accipi vel intelligi debere, qui Sancto Oleo Chriſmatis perungi poſſunt, quo ab Epiſcopo confecto, non ſolum ſacerdotibus, ſed omnibus uti Chriſtianis licet in ſuâ aut ſuorum neceſſitate inungendo. Cæterùm illud ſuperfluum videmus adjectum, ut de Epiſcopo ambigatur quod Presbyteris licere non dubium eſt. Nam idcirco de Presbyteris dictum eſt, quia Epiſcopi occupationibus aliis impediti ad omnes languidos ire non poſſunt. Cæterum ſi Epiſcopus aut poteſt aut dignum ducit aliquem à ſe viſitandum, & benedicere, & tangere Chriſmate ſine cunctatione poteſt, cujus eſt ipſum Chriſma conficere. Pœnitentibus autem iſtud infundi non poteſt, quia genus eſt Sacramenti. Nam quibus reliqua Sacramenta negantur, quomodo unum genus putatur poſſe Concedi? *Innoc.* Ep. 1. n. 8.

made

made the Chriſme it ſelf, may without all ſcruple, bleſs and anoint with it. But the Chriſme is not to be given to Penitents, becauſe 'tis a kind of a Sacrament: For how can one kind of a Sacrament be allowed to thoſe to whom the reſt are denied?

Now here indeed is a Reſolution of ſome Queſtions concerning Unction of the ſick; but to fanſy, that what the Church of *Rome* calls the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, was the ſubject of this place, is ſo wild an Imagination, that altho *All the Catholicks* have entertain'd it, I cannot but wonder how it ſhould enter into any wiſe man's head. For 'tis in effect to ſay, That altho this Unction was a Sacrament publiſhed by St. *James*, and had been applied to the ſick conſtantly for above three hundred years; yet there was a certain Biſhop well eſteemed by his Holineſs, who was ſo Uncatechized, that he neither knew who might receive this Sacrament, nor who might give it. I acknowledge, that if this be *Innocent*'s Epiſtle, I have made a little bold with him upon the account of his groſs miſtakes in it. But *Bellarmine* and the reſt of his *Catholicks*, repreſent him ten times worſe; and in plain terms they abuſe him. And therefore here I muſt be the Pope's Advocate, and do him ſo much right, as to ſay, That if the Biſhop of *Eugubium* had been ſo ſtupidly ignorant, who were to receive Extreme Unction, and who were to apply it; yet at leaſt the Biſhop of *Rome*, whom he conſulted in the Caſe, would have wondered at it a little, inſtead of giving him ſuch cool and formal Anſwers, as if *Decentius* had ſtarted ſome new difficulties which before his time there was no occaſion to inquire about: Unleſs they will make Pope *Innocent* as ignorant as the Biſhop of *Eugubium* muſt be ſuppoſed to be. But tho the

Pope

Pope was so egregiously mistaken in the History of the propagation of the Gospel over the *Western*, and some of the *Southern* parts of the World, and in the Discipline of the Church concerning Fasting days; yet that he should be ignorant too of the use of one of the proper Sacraments of the Church, till *Decentius* gave him occasion to inform himself better, is an imputation no less incredible in it self, than reproachful to him. This ought not by any means to be believed of a *learned man and a holy*, and one *wonderfully commended by* Austin, Hierom, *and* Chrysostom.

Bellarmine indeed would persuade us, that the Bishop inquired only, (w) *Whether a Bishop might give the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, or a Presbyter only.* A very fine Question for a Bishop to send to *Rome*, if that were all? But, by his leave, *Decentius* asked more questions than so, or else the Pope ran out in his Answer very impertinently; and that he inquired something farther, is very evident from his own words, who coming to that point, says, * *But for what is added, your doubt is needless*, &c. which manifestly implies, that there were other doubts; to which that was *added* concerning the power of a Bishop to anoint, *&c.* as indeed there was one or two before it, and another after it. So that they make this entercourse between *Decentius* and *Innocentius*, to be just as if one of the Bishops of the *Roman* Communion should write to the present Pope, to know whether Extreme Unction might be given to the faithful in their sickness, whether they might anoint themselves, whether a Bishop might anoint them, and (as I shall presently shew the Case to be the same) whether Excommunicated persons, in no danger of death, might be anointed as well as the rest; and the Pope

(w) Ubi supra. §. *Ex hoc etiam.*

* Cæterùm illud superfluum videmus adjectum, ut de Episcopo ambigatur, *&c.*

Pope ſhould make ſuch an Anſwer as *Innocent* did. For if Extreme Unction was then underſtood and practiſed in the Church, as it is now in the Church of *Rome*, thoſe two antient Biſhops were altogether as ridiculous, as his Holineſs and ſome other Biſhop now would be upon ſuch a ſuppoſition.

So that *Extreme Unction* cannot be meant in this place; and which makes this pretended teſtimony for it come off very miſerably; we need not deſire a better Argument, that in thoſe dayes the Church knew nothing at all of the now *Roman* Doctrine or practiſe of that Unction; for if it was then as 'tis now, theſe two antients talked of the matter before them like a couple of Ideots, and were ſo far from deſerving to be *Biſhops*, that they were not worthy to be accounted *Novices* in Chriſtianity; which will more fully appear by a brief account of the Pope's *reſolutions*, and the *Queſtions* which *they* ſuppoſe the Biſhop to have ſent.

We have already ſeen, that the pretended Sacrament of Unction, cannot be the ſubject of the Diſcourſe in that Epiſtle; And the reaſons already offered make it neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that it was ſome new thing that had not been formerly thought of in the Church. Nor do we need to go far for a Key to unlock this myſtery, ſince the place it ſelf affords one, which is this, That the Inquiries of *Decentius*, and the Pope's Anſwers, went all upon the *Oil of Chriſme*, which *Oil* (by the way) is not the matter of the late Sacrament of Unction; it being compounded Oil that was kept in the Church for anointing, not the ſick, but thoſe that were in health, that is to ſay, newly Baptized perſons, and ſuch as were made Biſhops

Pope was ſo egregiouſly miſtaken in the Hiſtory of the propagation of the Goſpel over the *Weſtern*, and ſome of the *Southern* parts of the World, and in the Diſcipline of the Church concerning Faſting days; yet that he ſhould be ignorant too of the uſe of one of the proper Sacraments of the Church, till *Decentius* gave him occaſion to inform himſelf better, is an imputation no leſs incredible in it ſelf, than reproachful to him. This ought not by any means to be believed of a *learned man and a holy*, and one *wonderfully commended by* Auſtin, Hierom, *and* Chryſoſtom.

Bellarmine indeed would perſuade us, that the Biſhop inquired only, (w) *Whether a Biſhop might give the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, or a Presbyter only.* A very fine Queſtion for a Biſhop to ſend to *Rome*, if that were all? But, by his leave, *Decentius* asked more queſtions than ſo, or elſe the Pope ran out in his Anſwer very impertinently; and that he inquired ſomething farther, is very evident from his own words, who coming to that point, ſays, * *But for what is added, your doubt is needleſs*, &c. which manifeſtly implies, that there were other doubts; to which that was *added* concerning the power of a Biſhop to anoint, *&c.* as indeed there was one or two before it, and another after it. So that they make this entercourſe between *Decentius* and *Innocentius*, to be juſt as if one of the Biſhops of the *Roman* Communion ſhould write to the preſent Pope, to know whether Extreme Unction might be given to the faithful in their ſickneſs, whether they might anoint themſelves, whether a Biſhop might anoint them, and (as I ſhall preſently ſhew the Caſe to be the ſame) whether Excommunicated perſons, in no danger of death, might be anointed as well as the reſt; and the Pope

(w) Ubi ſupra. §. *Ex hoc etiam.*

* Cæterùm illud ſuperfluum videmus adjectum, ut de Epiſcopo ambigatur, *&c.*

Pope ſhould make ſuch an Anſwer as *Innocent* did. For if Extreme Unction was then underſtood and practiſed in the Church, as it is now in the Church of *Rome*, thoſe two antient Biſhops were altogether as ridiculous, as his Holineſs and ſome other Biſhop now would be upon ſuch a ſuppoſition.

So that *Extreme Unction* cannot be meant in this place; and which makes this pretended teſtimony for it come off very miſerably; we need not deſire a better Argument, that in thoſe dayes the Church knew nothing at all of the now *Roman* Doctrine or practiſe of that Unction; for if it was then as 'tis now, theſe two antients talked of the matter before them like a couple of Ideots, and were ſo far from deſerving to be *Biſhops*, that they were not worthy to be accounted *Novices* in Chriſtianity; which will more fully appear by a brief account of the Pope's *reſolutions*, and the *Queſtions* which *they* ſuppoſe the Biſhop to have ſent.

We have already ſeen, that the pretended Sacrament of Unction, cannot be the ſubject of the Diſcourſe in that Epiſtle; And the reaſons already offered make it neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that it was ſome new thing that had not been formerly thought of in the Church. Nor do we need to go far for a Key to unlock this myſtery, ſince the place it ſelf affords one, which is this, That the Inquiries of *Decentius*, and the Pope's Anſwers, went all upon the *Oil of Chriſme*, which *Oil* (by the way) is not the matter of the late Sacrament of Unction; it being compounded Oil that was kept in the Church for anointing, not the ſick, but thoſe that were in health, that is to ſay, newly Baptized perſons, and ſuch as were made Biſhops

‖ Vide §. 1.

ſhops and Prieſts. ‖ This ſort of Unction we have already ſeen to have been practiſed in the Antient Church. And 'tis the Oil for ſuch purpoſes, concerning which *Decentius* inquir'd, whether and how it might be adminiſtred to the ſick, that is, applied to a new purpoſe for which the Church never uſed it before. As to the occaſion upon which he made this inquiry, poſſibly if we had his Letter we ſhould find it mentioned there. But ſince we have it not, we can but gueſs; and I believe it will be a hard matter to mend (*x*) Mr. *Daillé*'s Conjecture; which is this. "'Tis very likely, that ſome who obſerved, that "Diſeaſes were by ſeveral miraculouſly cured, and "this by applying Oil, and had read in St. *James* "thoſe words, *Is any one ſick*, &c. being ſick themſelves, deſired of *Decentius*, that they might be anointed with the *Chriſm*, which they knew to be in "the Church, not knowing but by this means they "might be healed; and thereupon that *Decentius* "inquired of *Innocentius*, what was in this caſe fit to "be done.

(*x*) De Extr. Unct. p. 100.

To which it may not be unfit to add, That as the Gift of Healing continued hitherto in the Church, ſo neither had all Presbyters that Gift, nor only they; nor was it exerted at the pleaſure of thoſe that had it; and therefore ſince the Rite of Anointing the ſick with Oil, went along with the uſe of the Gift, neither could the ſick expect to be anointed upon their deſire, either by the Presbyters that had not the Gift, or by thoſe, or any others, that had it. Which I ſay to prevent that Objection againſt Mr. *Daillé*'s Conjecture; That probably the ſick would rather have deſired

deſired the Prieſts to anoint them with Oil, or ſome others that had the Gift of Healing ſo to do, than to be anointed with *Chriſm*: For there is no ground for this at all, unleſs it had been part of the Prieſtly office to anoint the ſick, as it is now in the *Roman* Communion; or unleſs they that had the Gift of Healing by Oil, could have exerted it when they pleaſed. And therefore it is reaſonable to ſay, That as it is the manner of People in diſtreſs to try every way they happen to think of which flatters them into hope of ſucceſs; ſo thoſe ſick Perſons who could not demand that Unction which accompanied the Supernatural Gift of Healing, yet at leaſt deſired to try what might be done by the uſe of the holy *Chriſm* that was reſerved in the Church for other purpoſes, not knowing but that the effect promiſed in S. *James* to the *Prayer of Faith*, might follow it.

But whatever the *occaſion* was, the uſe of *Chriſm* to a new purpoſe, was the *ſubject* of the Inquiry; And the ground upon which *Decentius* went, was, that the Text was to be underſtood of the Faithful that were ſick, as *Innocent* acknowledged; and hereupon as it ſhould ſeem by the Anſwers of the later, the Queſtions of the former were theſe Four:

1. *Whether the Faithful that were ſick might be anointed with Chriſm*? To which the Pope anſwered, That *they might*. Now if by *Chriſm*, was meant what they call the *Sacrament of Extreme Unction*, and what they ſuppoſe was acknowledged by both of them and by the whole Church in thoſe days; it was a very ſenſleſs Queſtion, and as ſenſleſs an Anſwer; and it might as well have been asked by the one, Whether the Faithful may receive the Euchariſt, and ſay their Prayers, and do what is their duty to do? and as

gravely anſwered by the other, That they might. But there is ſome ſenſe in it, if we underſtand the Queſtion of the applying of that *Chriſm* to the ſick, which was hitherto uſed in the Church for other purpoſes.

2. *Whether the ſick might in their need anoint themſelves with it.* To which the Pope anſwered, That *they might*; For, ſays he, *Not only Prieſts, but all Chriſtians may lawfully uſe in their own need, or in theirs who belong to them, the Oil of Chriſm prepared by the Biſhop, and anoint with it.* Now if this was meant of Extreme Unction, it argued great ſtupidity in *Decentius* to inquire whether Lay-Chriſtians might Adminiſter a Sacrament to themſelves and to others, which it was lawful for none to Adminiſter, but a Presbyter at leaſt, as we are told by the Council of *Trent:* And in the Pope it was unpardonable Ignorance to determin this Queſtion the wrong way, by allowing that all Chriſtians might uſe this Sacrament, by Anointing themſelves or their Friends with it. But if we underſtand the uſe of *Chriſm* in order to Healing, there was ſome reaſon for this Queſtion, ſince on the one ſide the ordinary uſe of *Chriſm* was applied only by Perſons in Orders, on the other ſide it was known that ſuch as were not in Orders, had with ſucceſs applied Oil to the Cure of the Sick; ſo that there was an appearance of Reaſon on both ſides to move *Decentius* to ask, Whether if the Faithful might be anointed with *Chriſm* in their ſickneſs, the Laity might anoint themſelves and others with it, as the Laity that had the Gift of Healing anointed with Oil? or whether they muſt leave it to the Prieſt, becauſe it was *Chriſm*. And *Innocent* in my opinion anſwered very well, that he knew nothing to the contrary, but they might do it themſelves.

3. *If*

3. *If they might not Anoint themſelves with it, it being clear from S.* James, *that Presbyters had power to Anoint the Sick, Whether Biſhops were included or not?* Now this ſeems to me to be no overwiſe Queſtion, let the ſuppoſition upon which 'tis asked be what it will. But if Extreme Unction went then in the Church, as it does now in the *Roman* Communion, the Queſtion was exceedingly fooliſh; for we are told that the (*y*) Miniſters of this Sacrament are Biſhops, or Prieſts rightly ordained by Biſhops. And, to ſet that aſide; who can imagin that a Biſhop ſhould doubt, whether a Biſhop had power to Adminiſter one of the Sacraments of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution? But though 'tis hard to ſay what came into his Head to move this Queſtion about the Biſhop's power to Anoint the *Sick with Chriſm*, yet the whole buſineſs being new, and he believing that it was to be governed by the Text of S. *James*, it was nothing near ſo extravagant a Queſtion, as it had been upon the ſuppoſition of Extreme Unction: Though indeed it was ſomething odd if we take it as it is; And therefore the Pope gave him a gentle gird for it, in theſe words: *But for what is added, 'tis a needleſs doubt, Whether a Biſhop may do that which is undoubtedly lawful for Presbyters?*

(*y*) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. cap. 3.

4. *Whether the Chriſm might be given to Penitents in their Sickneſs?* Now if *Chriſm* had been the *Extreme Unction* of the *Roman* Church, 'tis not imaginable that *Decentius* ſhould have asked ſuch a Queſtion as this. For if by the Sick, to be anointed, he had meant only the dying, there had been no room for that Queſtion, Whether *ſick*, i. e. *dying* Penitents might be anointed, it being a notorious cuſtom of the Church * in thoſe days to communicate thoſe that were admitted to Penance, if they were in evident danger of

* Innoc. Ep. III. n. 2.

Death. But 'tis evident, that both *Decentius* and *Innocentius* ſpake of all that were viſited with Sickneſs, though in appearance the Sickneſs were not mortal, (for *Innocentius* ſpeaks ſimply of the Sick, and ſays that the Biſhop cannot viſit all the Sick, and the like.) And the Queſtion thus taken, *viz.* Whether all ſick Penitents might be anointed, was a very ignorant Queſtion, if he meant *Extreme Unction*, and that becauſe it was notorious that they who were in the ſtate of *Penitents*, were denied all manner of Sacraments, (unleſs in the Article of Death) as *Innocent* obſerved in his Anſwer to this Queſtion.

If it be objected, That *Decentius* bewraied as much ignorance, if he put this Queſtion concerning the Unction of the ſick Penitents, with proper *Chriſm*, ſince *Innocentius* anſwering in the *Negative*, thought fit to give this reaſon for his Anſwer, That *all Sacraments were denied to Penitents*. I Anſwer, That there was a reaſonable ground upon which *Decentius* might move ſuch a Queſtion; For though *Chriſm* was eſteemed a kind of Sacrament, yet whether it might not be applied for the recovery of their bodily health, to whom Sacraments were yet denied, was a doubt which a wiſe Man might make. For ſince the Sick in that place deſired to try the ſucceſs of being anointed with *Chriſm*, in order to the ſame effect that they knew anointing with Oil, by thoſe that had the Gift of Healing, produced upon ſick Perſons; it might be thought that this uſe of *Chriſm*, juſt now ſtarted, might be exempted from the common Rule, eſpecially becauſe there were inſtances of ſome cured by Oil † that were not ſo much as *Chriſtians*. And though *Innocent* concluded in the *Negative*, yet the Queſtion would have born a Diſpute in behalf of the Penitents,

† Spondan. A. C. 63. N. IV.

if

if upon trial of the virtue of holy *Chriſm* to cure the Sick, the matter had been found to deſerve it.

And here we are come to the place upon which *Bellarmin* triumphs, as if *Innocentius*'s Teſtimony alone would do the buſineſs. *He ſays expreſly and clearly*, ſays the Cardinal, *That this Unction is a Sacrament explain'd by S.* James, *and therefore not to be given to thoſe who are not capable of other Sacraments*, &c. What a ſmall matter will ſerve the turn, where there is a good will, but no manner of good reaſon for the Concluſion! *That this Unction is a Sacrament*? What Unction I pray? Not *Bellarmin*'s *Extreme Unction*: for of that he ſpeaks not a word; and as I have abundantly ſhewn, *Innocentius* cannot be underſtood as ſpeaking of that, by any Man that has a grain of ſenſe, and is withal as honeſt as he ſhould be. But here lies the ſecret, that there is mention of *Unction*, and that of the Sick too, and moreover that there is the word *Sacrament*; and ſo without any more to do, it muſt be the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* that is ſpoken of, as if no other account were to be given of the place. But let the place it ſelf be produced, which *Bellarmin*, (to be even with him for his cenſure of *Chemnitius*) was *afraid* to produce; and the impertinence of appealing to it, will immediately appear. *But the Chriſm is not to be given to Penitents, becauſe 'tis a KIND of a Sacrament. For how can one kind of a Sacrament be allowed to thoſe, to whom the reſt are denied?* By which 'tis evident that 'tis not *Unction* of the *Sick*, much leſs *Extreme Unction* of the Sick, but the very *Chriſm* it ſelf, the *Chriſm* I ſay which had been bleſſed by the Biſhop, that *Innocent* calls a Sacrament. With *this Sacrament* they anointed thoſe that were baptized, that were ordained Prieſts, that were conſecrated Biſhops; And the applying of it to the Sick

made

made it not one jot more a Sacrament, than it was before. But then how does he ſtile it a *Sacrament*? Far enough I am ſure from *Bellarmin*'s purpoſe. He ſays, *'tis a kind of a Sacrament.* Now that which is a *kind of a Sacrament*, is not a Sacrament properly ſo called, ſuch as *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt* are, but that which in ſome reſpect may be ſo called. And many ſuch Sacraments there were in thoſe times, more than ſeven times ſeven, as every Man knows that is verſed in the Antients. Every ſign of a holy thing, every thing bleſſed to a Religious uſe, and not only the Ceremonies of the Chriſtian Church, but ſometimes the myſteries of *Moſes*'s Law, and the Types of *Chriſt* that were amongſt the Iſraelites, were called Sacraments. 'Tis very much that *Bellarmin* did not produce for his Sacrament of Extreme Unction that ſaying of (z) *Tertullian*, *Jeſus* was called *Chriſt from the Sacrament of Unction.* But to clear this matter from all ſhadow of ſcruple, I will here tranſcribe out of this very Epiſtle, what ſhall be able to do it alone.

(z) Adv. Prax. C. 28.

† Ubi Supra n. 5.
* Tituli.
‡ Paroeciæ.

† *Concerning the Fermented Bread which we ſend about the* * City Pariſhes *upon Lords days, you had no need to ask our opinion, ſince all our Churches are within the City; whoſe Presbyters becauſe they cannot be with us upon that day, by reaſon of their Flocks committed to them; Therefore of the Acolytes they take the Bread, which is bleſſed by us, that they may eſpecially upon that day be judged not to be ſeparated from our Communion; which* ‡ *ſhould not be done through the Country Pariſhes as I conceive, becauſe Sacraments are not to be carried a great way off.* Here he calls the *bleſſed Bread* or *Holy Bread* which was ſent about to the Pariſhes of the *Dioceſs*, (but at *Rome*, it ſeems, only to the Pariſhes of the *City*) to teſtifie unity of Communion; he calls it, I ſay, a

Sacra-

Sacrament; not ſo much as qualifying it with that diminution, *A kind of a Sacrament*, which he beſtowed upon *Chriſm*. And yet in a proper ſence one was juſt ſuch a Sacrament as the other, that is, not at all; but both of them come under that ſort of things, which the *Romaniſts* themſelves call *Sacramentals*, or Rites that have ſome kind of likeneſs to *Sacraments* truely ſo called.

And thus much concerning the Teſtimony of *Innocentius* I. which had not deſerved an Anſwer of ten lines, but that *All the Catholicks produce it*, and the Cardinal would bear us in hand that it *ought to ſuffice*, though there were never another. And he confeſſes that they (*a*) *have not many Teſtimonies of this kind, that is, ſo antient and ſo expreſs, as this is*; *becauſe* the Antients *had not occaſion to write of this matter.* That they had no occaſion to write of Extreme Unction, is undoubtedly true; for there could be no occaſion to write of a thing that was never dream'd of till ſome hundreds of years after. But if this be the moſt antient and expreſs Teſtimony they have, it had been better for them that *Decentius* had never conſulted *Innocentius* about anointing the Sick with *Chriſm*, that they might have had no occaſion of appealing to thus much Antiquity for *Extreme Unction*, by which, if that be a thing they care for, they have expoſed themſelves to open ſhame.

(*a*) Ubi ſupra, Cap. IV. § *Ex hoc*, &c.

But now it may be expected that *Innocent* III. for coming ſo ſhort of the other in point of Antiquity, ſhould at leaſt make amends for that, by the plainneſs and expreſneſs of his Teſtimony. And ſo he does, if the Cardinal may be believed, who aſſures us that *Innocent* III. *gives teſtimony to this Sacrament largely and clearly.* But ſo he does not, if one may believe that

that Pope himſelf expreſſing his own mind in the place to which the Cardinal refers us. For neither can I, nor, I am confident, did he find more in it, than this, that the Pope having diſtinguiſhed between the *inward* and the *outward* Unction, *quoted* S. *James* for the later, and then tells us, That (*a*) *in order to the outward and viſible Unction, Oyl is bleſſed, which is ſaid to be the Oyl of the Catechumens, and of the Sick, and Chriſm is prepared which is made of Oyl and Balm, for a myſtical reaſon.* But neither does he ſpeak one word of Extreme Unction, nor does he make the anointing of the Sick *a Sacrament* any more than the anointing of thoſe that were learning their Catechiſm. And the truth is, the great buſineſs of that Chapter is to explain the myſtery of anointing Biſhops. So that one would wonder why the Cardinal ſhould pretend that even this Pope's teſtimony is given *largely* and *clearly*: though if it had, the teſtimony had been very impertinent, ſince it is no proof at all that Extreme Unction ſtands upon the *Tradition of the Antients*. For this Pope lived in the thirteenth Age, as we obſerved before, was a Man as degenerate from the Antient Biſhops of *Rome*, as the Age in which he lived was from the Primitive times; He was a Depoſer of Princes, and a horrible perſecutor of Gods ſervants; nor is his teſtimony, what ever it had been, worth conſidering, but only to ſhew that the zealous Men of that Church, are reſolved not to want Authorities, though there are none to be had. And ſo much for the Teſtimony of Popes.

(*a*) Decretal. Gr. lib. 1. Tit. 15.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

That Extreme Unction has not the Teſtimony of any Antient Council.

IN the ſecond place we are told of *Councils*, that prove the Antiquity of Extreme Unction. And the firſt that they bring forth is that of *Nice*; witneſs the *ſixty ninth Canon* of the *Latin* Tranſlation of the *Arabic*, *where*, ſaith *Bellarmin*, (*b*) *expreſs mention is made of the Oyl of the ſick, and it is diſtinguiſhed from Chriſm, and from the Oyl of the Catechumens.* And ſo there is ſome hope that we ſhall be troubled no more with Chriſm, inſtead of *Extreme Unction*; which two things, the Cardinal, it ſeems, ſaw well enough, did not infer one another, though he was willing to forget it, to make room for the famous teſtimony of *Innocentius*. But to make riddance of the teſtimony in hand: this ſixty ninth Canon with the other ſeventy nine *Arabic* ones, its fellows, is all a ſenſleſs forgery, for which we are beholden to the Face of *Turrian* the Jeſuit; (to who) caſt the better grace upon his Work, brings in the *African* Fathers for witneſſes that there were more than twenty Canons of that Council; though the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches knew of no more. (*c*) *For*, ſays he, *if they had not been very ſure* there were yet other Canons, they had never deſired the Copies of the Acts of that Council from the *Eaſtern* Sees: when all the World knows that they deſired it upon no ſuch account, but only to deliver themſelves from the importunity of the Biſhop of *Rome* claiming a right of appeals from them, upon a forged Canon of *Nice*.

(*b*) Ubi ſupra, Cap. IV. §. *Deinde ex Conciliis*, &c.

(*c*) Turrian. Procem. in Canon. Arab.

The truth is, this sixty ninth Canon is a very foolish one, and altogether unworthy of those Fathers. It shews how they are to be reconciled that were led from the Faith by Fornication with Infidels, *viz.* amongst other things, by sprinkling them with Water and Oyl blessed, *as water is blessed for the purifying of their uncleanness, who had eaten any thing that died of it self.* What stuff is this?

And yet this worthy Canon cannot be made to speak for that purpose for which 'tis brought; for it says, *the Priest must bless Water and Oyl, not as 'tis blessed in Baptism, nor as Chrism is blessed, but as the Oyl of the Sick is blessed, and as Water is blessed for the purifying*, &c. But does it say that the Oyl of the Sick is blessed for *Sacramental* Unction of the Sick? No more, I assure you, than that Water is blessed for the *Sacramental* purification of those that had eaten Carrion. In a word here is no mention so much as of *Extreme Unction*, which at least had been necessary, to make this testimony worth any notice. But 'tis a misfortune that will some times happen; to bring forth a Forgery, and to get nothing by it.

The Cardinal having made all sure by a General Council, tells us, that they *have particular Councils too*, but then they *are Antient* ones, he says; And yet not so *Antient*, neither. For the first he mentions is the second Synod of C[illegible]on which was held in the ninth Age; and therefore at too great a distance from the beginning, to prove a Sacrament by the testimony of the *Antients*. But however let us hear the Canon to which we are referred: (*d*) *According to the Instruction of S.* James, *with which also the instructions of the Fathers do agree, the Sick ought to be anointed*

(*d*) Can. 48. Tom. 7. Labb.

nointed by the Presbyters, with Oyl that is bleſſed by the Biſhops. For ſo he ſays, Is any one Sick, &c. *Therefore this kind of Medicine is not to be undervalued, which heals the diſtempers of Soul and Body.* The Cardinal's gloſs upon this Canon, is, that *the Council ſpeaking of this Sacrament ſays, that the Decrees of the Fathers are conſonant to the Epiſtle of S.* James. But he did very well to ſuppreſs the words of the Canon it ſelf; for otherwiſe it had been evident that it does not ſpeak of *his Sacrament*, as he, of his own head, ſays it does: For indeed it ſpeaks of no Sacrament at all; the word *Sacrament* at which elſewhere he is ſo ready to take advantage, being not ſo much as here mentioned. Moreover that Unction of which this Synod ſpake, was for healing the diſtempers of the Body, and therefore very different from the *Roman* Unction, which is principally for thoſe that are drawing on to the laſt gaſp. And as for the diſeaſes of the Soul which it was ſaid to heal too, there is no reaſon that the Synod ſhould be interpreted otherwiſe, than according to the Text which they cited; where 'tis ſaid, *If he hath committed ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him*: that is to ſay, that the firſt and conſtant intention in Unction of the Sick, was to relieve their Bodies, and in ſome caſes it would alſo be beneficial to their Souls.

But by this time I grant there was a certain cuſtom of anointing the Sick, ſlipt into the Church, ſomething different from the judgment and practice of more antient times, but withal a great deal more different from the modern doctrine and practice of the Church of *Rome*. This I ſhall ſhew more particularly in its proper place, and that although thus much Antiquity comes too late to conclude us

in points wherein it was ſingular, yet it does effectually condemn the *Roman* Church in points wherein it was not ſo, becauſe it ſhews the lateneſs of *their* Innovations.

As for the Synod of *Worms* held in the year 868, which he next mentions; he confeſſes that the Canon he refers to, renews the Decree of *Innocentius*. The truth is, that Canon does word for word repeat all that paſſage in the Epiſtle of *Innocentius*, which we have conſidered before, and this without the leaſt Preface to it, or Note upon it. This therefore inſtead of being a Teſtimony to Extreme Unction, is a good Argument that thoſe Fathers knew no more of it, than the Biſhops of *Rome* and *Eugubium* did above 400 years before.

Can. 72.

He cites alſo a Canon of a Synod at *Meaux* out of *Burchardus*, commanding that *upon Good-Friday Eve the Rectors of Pariſhes ſhould receive a Glaſs of holy Oyl from the Biſhop for the anointing of the Sick, according to Apoſtolical Tradition.* Now whether there ever was ſuch a Canon made at *Meaux* or not, 'tis all one to us; for that it was now the cuſtom to anoint all Sick perſons, we readily grant, but that it was either Extreme or Sacramental Unction, we flatly deny; nor is there a word to that purpoſe in the Canon now cited.

(*t*) Aquiſgr. 2. Cap. 2. §. 1. Can. 8. † *In quo ſalvatio infirmorum creditur.*

The next is the ſecond Synod of *Aken* (*t*), which requires that once a Year the Biſhops in all Cities do not neglect the Benediction of Holy Oil, † *wherein the relief of ſick Perſons is believed to be.* What ſays *Bellarmin* upon this? *The Canon*, ſays he, *requires, that this Sacrament be not neglected, in which the Salvation of the Sick is contained.* But does it ſpeak of *Extreme Unction*, or of *Sacramental Unction*? Yes, they will ſay, for

for it ſpeaks of that *Unction* in *which the Salvation of the Sick is contained*; But the Canon does not ſay as *Bellarmin* does, but that the Health or Salvation of the Sick is *believed* to be in that Unction; which is as much as to ſay, that their Unction was believed to be very profitable towards the recovery of a ſick Mans Health. And that this was the meaning of the Fathers, appears from their inſtructions to the Presbyters concerning the care they ought to have of the Sick, which is expreſſed in theſe words, (*f*) *But if he* [his Pariſhioner] *be grieved with Sickneſs, let him not by his* [the Presbyters] *negligence want Confeſſion, and the Prayer of the Prieſt, or the Anointing of holy Oil.* Laſtly, *If he perceives his end approaching, let him commend the Chriſtian Soul, as a Prieſt ſhould do, to the Lord his God, with the reception of the Holy Communion, and his Body to be buried in a Chriſtian manner.* By which you ſee there are two ſtates of the ſick Perſon conſidered, one when he is *depreſt by ſickneſs*, the other when he *is drawing to his end*; And that the Anointing with Oil is preſcribed as proper to the former, *viz.* while good hope of life laſted; not to the latter, as 'tis now in the Church of *Rome*, when he ſeemed to be near his end; For in that caſe they preſcribed the Adminiſtration of the Communion. Which ſhews that by *believing the Salvation or Health of the Sick to be in* Unction; which they had obſerved not long before, they meant the common belief of the profitableneſs of Unction to raiſe up the Sick, and to reſtore him to Health. For if they had taken Unction to be the *Sacrament of the dying*, according to the new Divinity of the *Trent*-Synod, they alſo would have preſcribed Unction in that caſe wherein 'tis plain they did not preſcribe it,

(*f*) Ibid. §. 24. Can. 5.

viz.

viz. * when it was perceived that Death was at hand.

* Si finem urgentem perſpexerit.

To conclude, whereas the Cardinal affirms, That the Council of *Mentz* under *Rabanus*, *affirms like things*; I do acknowledge that in this he ſays the truth, for they require (*g*) that *according to the decrees of the Fathers, the Sick ſhould be heartned with Prayers, Conſolations, and holy Unction, and refreſhed with the Communion*; where 'tis again obſervable, that the Unction is to go before; and then the Communion to follow; which later that they required in caſe of ſuch a proſpect of death, as the Synod of *Aken* ſpeaks of, is plain from their calling the Communion, the *Viaticum*, or * the Food for their paſſage out of this into the other World. But if they had dreamt of the *Extreme Unction* of the Church of *Rome*, that, and not the Euchariſt had been preſcribed in the laſt place, to fortifie the Soul in her laſt conflicts.

(*g*) Mog. I. Can. 26.

* Communione Viatici reficiantur.

And now the ſumm of his Teſtimonies for *Extreme Unction* out of Ancient Councils, comes to this, That he has not one genuine Canon of a Council to pretend, till the Ninth Age; and there is not one that he appeals to in that Age neither; but, all things conſidered, it rather makes againſt him than for him. And ſo much for Ancient Councils.

SECT.

SECT. V.

That Extreme Unction *has not the Teſtimony of any Ancient Father.*

HE pretends that they (*h*) *have two kinds of Teſtimonies from the Fathers. One of thoſe who indeed do not expreſly ſay, that this is one of the Sacraments; but yet they expreſly ſay, That the words of S.* James *belong to us, and that the Presbyters ought now and in all times to do that which S.* James *deſcribes.* Now if he had ſuch Teſtimonies as theſe to produce, they would not in the leaſt affect our Cauſe, ſince we alſo ſay that this place of S. *James belongs to us*, as I have already ſhewn, [P. I. §. 8.] and that it preſcribes ſome things which there will be occaſion for in all Ages of the Church, and nothing but what is very fit to be done when there is the ſame occaſion for it that there was at firſt. But let us however conſider the Teſtimonies themſelves.

(*h*) Ubi ſupra §. Jam vero ex patribus, &c.

The firſt he refers to, is *Origen*'s ſecond *Homily* upon *Leviticus*; where there are ſeven ways laid down of obtaining remiſſion of ſins; the ſeventh being expreſſed in that paſſage which the Cardinal meant. The words are theſe: (*i*) *There is yet a ſeventh way, though it be hard and painful; when the ſinner waſhes his Bed with tears, and tears are his meat day and night, and when he is not aſhamed to ſhow his ſin to the Prieſt of the Lord, and to ſeek for Healing, according to him who ſaith, I ſaid I will confeſs againſt my ſelf my tranſgreſſions unto the Lord, and thou forgaveſt the ungodlineſs of my heart. In which alſo is fulfilled that which the Apoſtle ſaith, Is any man ſick, let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them*

(*i*) Ultra med.

lay

lay their hands upon him, anointing him with Oil in the Name of the Lord, and the Prayer, &c. Now here indeed *Origen* says, that in the *Penitence* which he described, in order to the *remission of sins*, that Text of S. *James* was fulfilled. Which is so far from being an Argument that he understood the Text of *Extreme Unction*, that 'tis a good Argument of the quite contrary; for 'tis manifest that he does not apply the Text to the case of a dying, or so much as a sick Person; but in general to the case of a sinner that anxiously seeks for Pardon, and is willing to undergo that hard and painful Penitence which he described. If therefore the Cardinal's meaning by this Testimony was to prove that *Origen* believed all was to be done in every Age which S. *James* directs, and in particular the *anointing with Oil*; then he must needs suppose that in *Origen*'s opinion S. *James* directed the anointing of *Penitents*, without any regard at all to a state of Health or Sickness. But if *Origen* had thought so, I dare say that he, (whatever the Cardinal might have done) would not have called this Unction, either the Sacrament of the dying, or Extreme Unction, or so much as the Unction of the Sick. Could any thing be more absurd than to pretend that this great Man produced S. *James*'s Text in favour of *Extreme Unction*, which is always of the sick or the dying; when the Persons to whom he applied it, and who were to be anointed, if he speaks of any that were to be so, might every one of them be in good and perfect Health? Only *Bellarmin*, of all Men should not have dealt in this fashion, because he says expressly afterward, That (*k*) *this Sacrament is as it were a kind of Penance of the Sick, who cannot do works of Penance.* But 'tis plain that those Persons to whom *Origen* applied the Text of S. *James*, were

(*k*) Ubi supra Cap. VII. §. Tertio nota.

were those that did works of Penance, and that a *hard* and *laborious* Penance too. It is not for nothing that the Cardinal does so often refer his Reader to Authorities, without producing the words themselves.

So that this Authority is grosly impertinent to the purpose for which 'tis brought; and though (*l*) *Genebrard* had some colour to make this place speak of *Sacramental Confession*, yet there is none in the World to produce it in favour of *Extreme Unction*. But then what was *Origen*'s meaning to say, that in the Penitence of a sinner, and God's Mercy to him, that was fulfilled which S. *James* said, *Is any man sick*, &c? I Answer, First, That although this Text was produced, yet it may be reasonably supposed, that *Origen* did not mean all was fulfilled that is there said, but only some part of it, *viz.* That which concerned calling for the Presbyter, and desiring his Prayers, and obtaining Remission of Sins, to which we are to add, *Confessing of Faults*, though he did not cite the Text so far. For that all should be fulfilled in the proper sense, by doing what he prescribed, is unconceivable; for to *weep*, and to *confess*, &c. is not *to be anointed with Oil*. I say therefore *Origen* might refer to some special passages in that Text, *viz.* those which might be well accommodated to his present purpose. (*l*) Orig. Paris.

Or, Secondly, According to the ingenious conjecture of Mr. *Daillé*, *Origen* allegorized this place after his manner, making the sick Man the Type of the sinner. (*m*) *As in S.* James, *the sick calls for the Presbyters, so here the sinner goes to the same. There the sick is anointed with Oil. Here the sinner is besmear'd with his own Tears, and as it were with the Unction of Penitence. There the sick Man is healed; here also the sinner is restored. And therefore* Origen *affirms that to be fulfilled* (*m*) Ubi supra, §. 93.

in the one, which S. James *affirmed properly and literally of the other. For every one knows, that as often as that is done which was expreſſed by a Type, ſo often the Type is ſaid to be fulfilled.* Which ſuppoſition is the more probable, becauſe in this Homily, that great Man's hand was in at *Allegorizing*: for there the Reader may find, that he diſcovered his ſeven ways of coming to Forgiveneſs in the Sacrifices of the Law. But whatever his meaning was, one thing is certain, that he did not mean *Extreme Unction*: And that is all we need to be ſure of at preſent.

(*n*) De Sacerdotio, L. III. c. 6.

To the ſame purpoſe is (*n*) S. *Chryſoſtom* quoted in the next place, but not a word produced that he ſays. For, indeed, he brings in the Text of S. *James* as an inſtance of that Prieſtly Dignity and Power which he was ſpeaking of; how available it is to obtain forgiveneſs of ſins for us not only in Baptiſm at firſt, but afterward by Diſcipline, Inſtruction and Prayers. But of the caſe of a dying or ſick Perſon he ſays not one word; which ſhews plainly enough that he produced the whole Text for the ſake only of the latter part of it which expreſſeth *forgiveneſs of ſins*, and that he thought this part of the Text might be underſtood of the *power of the Keys*, which was the ſubject of his diſcourſe, both before and after the mentioning of this Text.

(*o*) Tom. III.

As little to the purpoſe is it, either that he found this Text quoted in S. *Auſtin*'s (*o*) *Speculum*; for no interpretation of it is given there; or that, as he obſerves, S. *Auſtin lays down thoſe paſſages only of the Scripture which are uſeful to us at all times*; as if this place of Scripture were of no uſe to us now, unleſs the Doctrine and uſe of *Extreme Unction* might be concluded, from it, the vanity of which conceit, we have already touched more than once.

(*p*) As

(*p*) As for the 215 Sermon, *De Tempore*, which comes next, 'tis none of S. *Auſtin*'s; but taken out of a Book written above 200 Years after his Death. And yet that which the Cardinal aims at here, does him not the leaſt ſervice. For though S. *James*'s Text is produced, yet 'tis to exhort the ſick to *anoint his own Body* with Oil, that the Church was to furniſh them withal, inſtead of going to Inchanters, Wizards, Soothſayers, and uſing Deviliſh arts to recover his Health. He muſt be a cunning Man indeed that can from hence make out either *Extreme Unction* for the Soul, or a Prieſt to Adminiſter it.

(*p*) Vid. Dallæum de Extr. Unct. p. 108, 113.

But his next ſtep is to the Treatiſe of the *Viſitation of the ſick*. And now we are gotten the Lord knows where. For *Bellarmin* himſelf confeſſeth, That it *ſeems to be falſly attributed to S.* Auſtin; only he adds, *It cannot be denied to be an ancient and good Book*. That's hard indeed: But yet *Eraſmus* denied it, who could judge of an Author as well as another Body, and calls (*q*) this Author *a prating fellow, neither Learned nor Eloquent*. And, in truth, 'tis ſuch a ſenſleſs Book, that he had reaſon to *be angry at the impudence or ignorance of thoſe that obtrude ſuch Writings upon us under the name of S.* Auſtin. And yet *Bellarmin* upon ſecond thoughts could not find in his heart to let this Book go for one that *ſeems* to be *none* of S. *Auguſtin*'s, but afterward choſe to ſay, (*r*) that he *had nothing certain about it*. For why? there is good evidence in it for worſhipping Croſſes and Images, and for Auricular Confeſſion, beſides the ſmall touch concerning the Spiritual ſignification of External Unction. Such Books as theſe they give up as unwillingly as a Man parts with a dying Friend; and ſeem to have no regret all the while for ſacrificing the reputation of the Fathers to the ſervice of their Cauſe.

(*q*) Cenſura in Viſit. Infirm.

(*r*) De Scriptor. Eccleſ. p. 171. Lugd.

Bede is mentioned next, who in his Notes upon *James* V. ſpeaking of the Unction there, hath theſe words: *And we read in the Goſpel that the Apoſtle alſo did this, and now the cuſtom of the Church is that the Sick ſhould be anointed with conſecrated Oyl by the Biſhops, and be healed thereby together with Prayer. Nor is it only lawful for Presbyters, but as Pope* Innocentius *writeth, for all Chriſtians alſo to anoint themſelves or their friends with it in their need.* So that *Bede* makes the Unction of S. *James*, to be the ſame with that of S. *Mark*, and that of the Church the ſame with both; the recovery of bodily health, being the end of all three; than which there could not be expected a better Teſtimony againſt Etreme Unction. But by this time we are ſo well uſed to the Cardinals Authorities, that we ought to wonder at nothing.

As for *Theophylact* in the eleventh Age, the Cardinal ſends us to his Notes upon S. *Mark*, where indeed he takes occaſion alſo to repeat the place of S. *James*, and from thence to ſhew the ſeveral ſignifications of anointing with Oyl; but of Extreme Unction, no, nor ſo much as of anointing the Sick, he ſaith not a word.

Laſtly, *Oecumenius* upon the V*th.* of S. *James*, tells us, That *whileſt our Lord converſed with Men, the Apoſtles did the ſame thing, anointing the Sick with Oyl, and healing them.* And therefore according to *Oecumenius* 'tis impoſſible to prove *Extreme Unction* from S. *James*, which is not a Rite of *healing the Sick*, but the *Sacrament of the Dying*.

Commend me to theſe Men for doing their work by Authorities of the Fathers, and Traditions of the Antients.

The

The second sett of *Bellarmin*'s *Fathers*, are those that (*s*) *expresly number this Unction amongst the Sacraments*, that is to say, they call *the Unction of the Sick, a Sacrament*, to which I have already said that if every Rite and Ceremony, to which Antient Writers have given the name of a *Sacrament*, must go for a Sacrament properly so called, the Church of *Rome* must mend her Councils and Catechisms, and multiply Sacraments exceedingly. But who are those Fathers? The most antient that he names is *Alcuinus*, who lived in the later end of the *8th.* Age, and the beginning of the *9th.* He was Scholar to Venerable *Bede*, and if in this matter he learned of his Master, we are secure enough that his Authority will do us no harm. But whether it would or not, we shall never learn from that * Book to which *Bellarmin* refers us, because it was none of his, but the work of a much later Writer, as *Quercetanus* has shewn in the Preface to the Edition of *Alcuinus*. But what is worst of all, the testimony of this Author, whoever he was, though it proves *Unction* of the Sick to be customary in his days, yet proves as clearly that *Extreme* Unction was not. For he distinguishes between the *Sick* and the *Dying*, shewing that the Sick indeed were anointed, but not those that were in extreme danger of Death, for which there was very good reason, since, even in those days Unction was used in order to bodily health, but not as a Sacrament to fortifie the Soul in her passage out of this Life. For a more particular account of this Authority, I refer the Reader to (*t*) Mr. *Daille*'s exquisite Discourse upon it.

(*s*) Ubi supra §. *Habemus deinde alios*, &c.

† De divinis Officiis cap. 47. 49.

(*t*) Ubi supra p. 119. *&c.*

Amalarius comes next, whose judgment concerning the use and end of that Unction which S. *James* mentions we have already seen [*P.* 1. §. 5.] and that in the

* De Offic. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 12.

the very * place to which the Cardinal refers us. This Writer does accordingly make the Unction of his time to be a *Remedy of ſickneſs*; and therefore they may as well make Life and Death to be one and the ſame thing, as have the confidence to make the Unction of *Amalarius* Extreme Unction.

And now we are brought to the borders of the Twelfth Age; for his next *Father* is Cardinal *Damiani*, who is yet far enough from acknowledging this Sacrament of Extreme Unction: For though he aſcribes ſpiritual effects to that Unction mentioned by S. *James*, yet he ſays, *health is reſtored by it*; and though he calls it a *Sacrament*, yet he makes it to be a † *Sacrament eſtabliſhed by the Fathers*, *i.e.* a Rite which the Fathers thought deſerved the name of a Sacrament, no leſs than many others, which yet were not of Divine Inſtitution, or univerſal and neceſſary obligation. And that this was his meaning, cannot, I think, reaſonably be denied by our Adverſaries, ſince he makes *Unction of the Sick*, not to be one of *Seven*, but of *Twelve* Sacraments which he reckons up in that place.

† Unde & Sancti Patres hanc Unctionem Sacramentum eſſe ſanxerunt.

But to make ſure of ſome body, *Bellarmin* goes on to S. *Bernard*, Father *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, and Father *Lombard*, who, I acknowledge, began to ſpeak of the Unction of the Sick as the Church of *Rome* does now. But then I cannot allow theſe to be *Antient* Fathers, for they were all Men of the Twelfth Age. And it is more than enough for us, that the great Cardinal having undertaken to prove *by the Tradition of the Antients*, that Extreme Unction is a Sacrament, has not been able to produce ſo much as one pertinent Teſtimony for it, of *Pope*, *Council* or *Father*, for above a thouſand years after *Chriſt*.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

That the ſilence of Antiquity, and the Circumſtances with which it is to be taken, are a poſitive proof that Extreme Unction has not the Tradition of the Antients, but is a notorious Innovation.

THough ſo great a failing is of it ſelf a reaſonable inducement to believe, that Extreme Unction was utterly unknown to Antiquity, yet there are many more evidences of it; which it may be worth the while to produce, if it be but to reprove the confidence of our Adverſaries, and to ſhew that they who make the greateſt noiſe of Antient Fathers and Councils, have the leaſt cauſe for it of all other Chriſtians in the World. And here I am entring upon a Subject which * Mr. *Daillé* has quite exhauſted, and have therefore no more to do than to bring into a narrow compaſs ſome of thoſe Arguments from Antiquity which he has brought together, and purſued at large with extraordinary judgment.

* De Extr. Unc. Lib. II. cap. 1.

In the firſt place; there is not the leaſt mention of this pretended Sacrament in *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* or *Cyprian*, nor in any of the Writers of the Three firſt Ages, who yet diſcourſe frequently and plainly of the Diſcipline and the Sacraments of the Chriſtian Church; and therefore it was not known to them. P. 61. 62.

2. Neither was it known in the Fourth Age, which afforded ſo many Chriſtian Writers, ſince not one of them mentions it, no not in treating upon the Sacraments and Rites of the Church: which had been as unpardonable negligence in them, if they had believed any

any such Sacrament as this, as it would be now in the Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to omit Extreme Unction when they pretend to give an account of the Sacraments. *Epiphanius* largely treats of the Doctrins, Rites, and Disciplines of the Church, in the close of his work against Heresies, and has not a word of Extreme Unction. The Counterfeit *Dionysius* in his *Eccl. Hist.* does with wonderful exactness and curiosity lay down all the mysteries of the Church from the Baptism, to the Funerals of the Faithful; but of Extreme Unction he is altogether silent. And so is the Author of the *Apostolical Institutions*, in his Eighth Book, where he undertakes to declare all *Ecclesiastical Forms* whatsoever.

P. 62, 63.

3. That for the first six Ages, though the manner and circumstances of the Deaths of many holy Persons were described very particularly by the Writers of those times, yet there is not the least intimation that so much as any one of them was anointed. *Eusebius* mentions it not of *Constantine*, or *Helen*; Nor *Athanasius* of *Anthony*; Nor *Gregory Nazianzen* of his Sister *Gorgonia*, or of *Gregory* his Father, or of *Basil*; Nor *Gregory Nyssen* of *Gregory* of *Neocæsara*, or of *Ephrem*; Nor *Ambrose* of his Brother *Satyrus*, or of *Theodosius*; Nor *Sulpitius* of *Martin*; Nor *Simeon Metaphrastes* of *Chrysostom*; Nor *Paulinus* of *Ambrose*; Nor *Hierom* of *Lucinius*, or *Hilarion*, &c. no nor of *Paula*, though he and her Daughter *Eustochium* were present at her end, nor S. *Augustin* of his Mother *Monica*, nor *Possidius* of S. *Augustin*.

Cap. 2. p. 66, 67, 68.

On the other hand in these later Ages, the Extreme Unction of those who dye in the *Roman* Communion, and have their Lives and Deaths written afterward, is seldom or never omitted, as appears by a vast number of

of Instances out of *Surius*, particularly of *Carolus Borromeus*, *Franciscus Borgia*, *Antonine* of *Florence*, *Bernardinus de Senis*. *Justinian* of *Venice*, Count *Eleazar*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *William* the Abbot, *Antony* of *Padua*, and the Famous *Dominic*, and a great many more, of whom 'tis expressly recorded that they had Extreme Unction. No other reasonable account can be given why this so very material a Circumstance should perpetually be omitted in describing the deaths of the Antient Christians, and hardly ever omitted upon the like occasion by *Roman* Writers; but that as the thing it self is now constantly practised in the Church of *Rome*, so it was utterly unknown to the Antient Church. P. 70.

4. That from the fifth Age to the ninth, they that wrote the deaths of Holy Persons, do very frequently remember that they received the Eucharist, never that they received Extreme Unction, before their departure out of this Life; which is proved by an abundance of Instances, out of *Bede* and *Surius*, &c. But had Extreme Unction been used in those times, no account can be given why the mention of that should be perpetually omitted, there being no manner of reason why it should not have been as frequently remembred as the other. Cap. 3. p. 73, 74. &c.

5. That to the ninth Age none of the Antients moved any Question concerning *Penitents* receiving or not receiving Extreme Unction before the Article of Death; whereas nothing had been more proper, if they had believed it to be the *Sacrament of the Dying*. For there was a diversity of Discipline as to the communicating of *Penitents* in the Fourth and Fifth ages, and so on, from that which obtained in the three First; and it consisted in this, that the First were more rigid, and Cap. 4. p. 75. &c.

denied the Euchariſt to thoſe in their departure out of this life, to whom the latter Ages allowed it. But if Extreme Unction had been then uſed, this diverſity had appeared in that, and not in the Euchariſt.

I ſhall produce no more of his Arguments to this purpoſe, theſe being abundantly ſufficient to ſatisfie any diſintereſted Man, that either there was no ſuch thing as Extreme Unction known in the Church for many Ages from the beginning, or elſe the Antients, and indeed all Chriſtian Writers that had any occaſion to treat of the forementioned things, for above a thouſand years after *Chriſt*, were guilty of unaccountable folly, and ſtupidity in one and the ſame thing, *i.e.* in omitting not only what was neceſſary for their purpoſe, but moreover plain and eaſie, and, one would think, unavoidable by men of common diligence and underſtanding.

That one conſideration, which *Chemnitius* objected againſt Extreme Unction, that there are no antient examples of Holy Men anointed in their Extremes, is of it ſelf ſufficient to carry the cauſe from the Church of *Rome* in point of Antiquity, after once it is made evident that there is no paſſage in any Antient Father that bears witneſs to that pretended Sacrament. Unleſs *Bellarmin*'s anſwer may paſs, that there are no ſuch examples, becauſe (*t*) *things that are generally known, and daily practiſed, do not uſe to be written.* But if this will do, 'tis impoſſible theſe men ſhould ever be convinced. For when we charge them with Innovation in any matters of Doctrine and Practice, if they can ſhew that thoſe things are *Written* in the Antients, we are certainly gone that way; for this proves that to have been well known, and commonly practiſed in the primitive times, which we pretend was but of yeſterday.

(*t*) Cap. VI. §. *Reſpondeo non exſtare, &c.*

yeſterday. But if we can ſhew that they were *not written*, we get nothing by it at all, for it ſeems the reaſon why they were *not written* is becauſe they were *generally known* and *daily practiſed.* If indeed there had been as pregnant teſtimonies to the uſe of Extreme Unction, as there are, for inſtance, to the anointing of the Baptized with *Chriſm*, one might have wondered that there ſhould be no mention of any one perſon in the Antient Church anointed in his extremes; but he could not from thence reaſonably conclude that there was no ſuch Unction, becauſe there is other kind of written teſtimony for it. But the *Chriſm* after Baptiſm, though of leſs moment than Extreme Unction, is plentifully atteſted, as I have ſhewn §. 1. but Extreme Unction not at all; and therefore to anſwer the Objection from want of any one example of this kind in Antiquity, by ſaying, That thoſe things were not written, becauſe they were *perfectly known*, is not to reaſon with an Adverſary, but to face him down.

Nor does he mend the matter by ſuppoſing that *Bernard* would not have omitted this Sacrament, although it is not written in his Life that he received it. For it appears by other teſtimonies of that Age, that Extreme Unction then began to be in uſe, and therefore we do not deny that S. *Bernard* was anointed in his Extremes, becauſe *Malachias* ſaid nothing of it. But that the lives of ſo many antient Chriſtians ſhould be written, and the manner of their dying punctually deſcribed, and not one of them ſaid to be anointed; this, we think, makes it very reaſonable to conclude that Extreme Unction had no being in thoſe days, and impoſſible for a reaſonable man to deny it, if upon no occaſion whatſoever there is any mention of it,

even where there was all imaginable reaſon to mention it, excepting this only, that there was no ſuch thing to be mentioned.

If to ſave the Cardinals ſincerity, it be ſaid, that he had before proved the Doctrine of Extreme Unction by other teſtimonies of Antiquity; I grant that he had done his beſt towards it, but whether to his own ſatisfaction or not, whether to warrant his putting off the want of ſo much as one example, by pretending that *known things are not written*, I ſhall leave the Reader to judge, upon this obſervation: When he had produced and amplified the teſtimony of *Innocentius*, he concludes thus. (*u*) *From this Teſtimony we gather why there are not many teſtimonies of this kind*, i.e. *ſo antient and ſo expreſs*, viz. *becauſe they had no occaſion of writing about this matter. For neither had* Innocentius *written upon it, if the Biſhop of* Eugubium *had not doubted whether a Biſhop might give the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.* Now let us lay theſe things together. When he excuſes himſelf from producing Examples; he tells us, *that things perfectly known and daily practiſed are not wont to be written.* Well! admitting this for the preſent, how ſhall we come to know that Extreme Unction was a thing perfectly known to Antiquity, and daily practiſed? Without all doubt by clear and unqueſtionable teſtimonys of another ſort, and ſuch as will more than ballance the want of Examples. And therefore it is to be hoped, that we ſhall not be put off with excuſes when thoſe teſtimonies are deſired. But alas! he begs our pardon here too; for *as things perfectly known are not written*, ſo likewiſe, *we have not many teſtimonies, ſo antient and ſo expreſs, becauſe there was no occaſion for them.* So that there are no antient examples of Extreme

(*u*) Cap. IV. §. *Ex hoc etiam, &c.*

treme Unction written, becauſe it was *perfectly known*; nor many Teſtimonies for it ſo ancient and ſo expreſs, for *want of occaſion.* Did ever Man talk in this faſhion, that thought his Cauſe was honeſt? And now at laſt the Teſtimony of *Innocentius* had need be a thundring Teſtimony, becauſe we have *not many ſo ancient and ſo expreſs.* And yet neither is his Teſtimony *ſo ancient*, being no older than the Fifth Age; nor is it *ſo expreſs*, unleſs becauſe 'tis *expreſly* againſt *Extreme Unction*; as I have manifeſtly ſhewn the Reaſon of that Teſtimony to be, though *Extreme Unction* be not named there.

After all, 'tis notoriouſly falſe, that *things perfectly known and daily uſed, are not written*, which is evident from this very inſtance, that ſince *Extreme Unction* came in faſhion, they ſeldom or never deſcribe the circumſtances of their Peoples dying, but they obſerve how they departed with this their Sacrament; of which Mr. *Daillé* has given great plenty of inſtances. † Ubi ſupra, p. 70, &c.

The Premiſſes are ſo clear and full, that without repeating them, I ſhall take leave to conclude, that they have not only no Tradition for their pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*; but that the Tradition of the Ancients is as plainly againſt it, as Tradition can be againſt an Innovation; & he muſt be a very unreaſonable Man that deſires better evidence of this kind for a *Negative.*

SECT.

SECT. VII.

Of the occaſions and beginnings of Extreme Unction; *how vaſt a change it made from the Primitive Unction, and by what degrees it was made.*

AND now it is eaſie from what hath been already produced in this Controverſie, to gather how and when this Myſtery of *Extreme Unction* gained footing in the *Roman* Communion. For it already appears, that there are three Unctions of the Sick to be diſtinguiſhed one from the other.

1. The Unction of the Sick that were miraculouſly cured, and of them only.

2. The Unction of all ſick Perſons whatſoever, but this in order to Bodily health.

3. The Unction not of all ſick Perſons, but of the deſperately ſick, or the dying, and this to take away the Reliques of ſin, and to fortifie their Souls againſt the Agonies of Death; which is the *Extreme Unction* of the *Roman* Church.

Now theſe three kinds of anointing the Sick being duly conſidered, will naturally guide us to the occaſions and degrees by which the laſt came to take place, and to the Age in which it began. For the firſt Unction in proceſs of time grew into the ſecond, and the ſecond at laſt into the third.

1. The firſt is not only an ancient Unction, but was from the beginning, *viz.* the anointing of thoſe that were healed by a Supernatural Gift. Which Gift continued in the Church more or leſs for ſix Ages after *Chriſt*, and was not quite worn out in the *ſeventh*, if we believe our Country-man *Bede* [§. 1.] about which time it was that the ſecond Unction of all

all ſick Perſons whatſoever took place. The chief inducement, to which, ſeemed to be the obſervation of thoſe Cures by anointing, that were wrought by ſuch as had the Gift of Healing; and the reports of miraculous Cures that were done alſo by the Sacraments of (*a*) Baptiſm, and (*b*) the Euchariſt, and (*b*) by Water bleſſed out of Baptiſm, and by the (*d*) Oyl of the Church-Lamps, contributed not a little to the bringing in of the cuſtom of anointing all ſick Perſons indifferently. We have already obſerved ſome beginnings of it in the Fifth Age, in the Epiſtle of *Innocentius*, by which it appears, that one of *Decentius* his Queſtions was this, Whether *Chriſm*, or the holy Oyl, that was reſerved in Churches might be applied to the Faithful in their ſickneſs; which *Innocentius* reſolved in the *Affirmative*. And no wonder that in an Age or two more, the cuſtom of anointing all ſick Perſons in order to their recovery was grown general, ſince very ſmall inducements are ſufficient to diſpoſe Men to ſeek for Temporal and Bodily relief, from things that are conſecrated to the uſes of Religion, eſpecially when there are ſome notable examples of ſucceſs. For as yet miraculous Healing by Oyl was not quite ceaſed; and by conſecrated Oyl other wonderful things were ſaid to be done beſides Healing the ſick; ſuch for inſtance as (*e*) *Bede* relates concerning the Voyage of *Utta*, a Presbyter, who came to *Aidan* and deſired his Prayers for a proſperous paſſage and return: *Aidan* gave him holy Oyl, telling him that he knew a Tempeſt would overtake him, and charged him that when it began he ſhould throw that into the Sea, for then all would be quiet again, as it happened. For ſuch reaſons as theſe, Chriſtians in their diſtreſs were diſpoſed to ſeek for relief and recovery, rather

(*a*) Aug. de Civ. D. lib. 22. c. 8.
(*b*) Naz. Orat. 11. p. 187.
(*c*) Theod. Hiſt. c. 21.
(*d*) Chryſ. in Matth. Hom. 33.
(*e*) Hiſt. Angl. lib. III. cap. 15.

rather by holy Oyl than by any other ſacred matter, eſpecially ſince the Text of S. *James* lay before them, and could be eaſily applied to this practice. So far at leaſt as to create ſome good hope of benefit. To all which we muſt add, That the great appearance of Piety that that practice made, being an expreſſion of repoſing greater confidence in God, than in the force of natural Remedies, made it paſs without oppoſition. And ſo entred,

2. The ſacred Unction of the Sick into the Church, not now of thoſe only, who were cured by the *Prayer of Faith*, but of all ſick Perſons whatſoever, in hope of receiving bodily relief by it. Which beginning at the Seventh Age, went on through the Eighth, Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Ages, to the beginning of the Twelfth. 'Tis of this Unction that the *Liber Sacramentorum*, ſaid to be Pope *Gregory*'s, gives a full account in the Office of Viſiting the Sick, where 'tis very plain that the Prayers upon that occaſion ſhew the principal end of Unction to be the recovery of the (*f*) ſick Perſons health. I confeſs, if that Book, as it is now publiſhed, were all of it uſed in Pope *Gregory* I. his time, it would be an argument, that in the Church of *Rome*, at leaſt, this practice of anointing all the Sick, had obtained in the Sixth Age; and perhaps *Decentius* his Letter to *Innocentius* I. had given a ſtart to it there, ſooner than it had in any other of the great Churches. But whether this Office for Viſiting the Sick was compoſed at the latter end of the Sixth Age, or afterwards; this one thing I am ſure of, that the Unction there referred to, was altogether accommodated, as by the Prayers it manifeſtly appears, to the raiſing up of the ſick Perſon, and the recovery of his health. Of this Unction it is that *Bede*, *Alcuinus*, *Amalarius*,

(*f*) See *Defence of Expoſition of the Order of the Church of* England, p. 45, &c.

Amalarius, the Synods of *Challon*, *Aken*, and *Mentz*, and *Peter Damiani* himſelf ſpake, as any one may ſee by what has been ſaid. Now this Unction was antient indeed, but yet a great way off from the beginning. It agreed with the Primitive Unction in this, that the profeſſed and direct deſign of it, was the recovery of bodily health; but in this it differ'd from it, that now all ſick perſons were anointed; whereas at firſt thoſe only were ſo for whom the ſupernatural Gift was exerted. They anointed before for bodily health, and did not fail of the end, becauſe they anointed as they were guided by a ſupernatural impulſe. But now they anointed for the ſame end, but muſt neceſſarily fail very often, becauſe they anointed in courſe, and it was grown a ſettled Office in the Church. For which reaſon it is ſomething to be wondred at, that this kind of Unction ſhould laſt ſo long as it did in the *Weſt*, and yet more, that it ſhould continue in the *Greek* Church to this very day, of which more in its place. For it muſt needs ſeem no little diſparagement to the Ceremony and to the Office belonging to it, that ſo little fruit of it ſhould appear, and that the experience of one Age after another plainly ſhew'd that the virtue and power that uſed to accompany it in the Primitive Church was now to be ſeen no more. But I believe the caſual cures which had happened without any Unction at all were conſtantly made uſe of to ſupport the Reputation of this Rite; to which not only the influence which the Prieſts had upon the People, and that reigning Opinion of thoſe Ages, that nothing guarded Religion more than the Amuſement of many Myſteries; but likewiſe the Zeal of pious and devout Chriſtians contributed very great aſſiſtance: Thus I ſay, this Practice might come to be ſupported ſo long together, that is to ſay, by Policy on the one ſide, and credulity on the other; and

no great harm was there in all this, till at laſt it brought forth *Extream Unction* in theſe parts of *Chriſtendom*. For the ſame Policy that had kept up the Rite of Anointing the ſick, upon the foundation of believing that it was good for their bodies, would, when that could hold no longer, lay another, *viz.* That at leaſt it was very good for their Souls; and that when it did not recover the Health of the Sick, yet at leaſt it had a wonderful Virtue to ſave the Soul of the Dying; which pretence had ſome advantages to keep up the Ceremony of Anointing the Sick, that the former had not, and all that it had. Here was enough to entertain the Zeal of wellmeaning People, and which was ſomething more, here was new comfort too, for the ſlothful and licentious. And in an Age ſo ignorant and barbarons as the Eleventh and Twelfth Ages were, it was eaſy to make this perſuaſion go down: And though Unction did not ſave the Soul, yet if the Prieſt ſaid it did, he was not ſo liable to be confuted, as when they ſaid it was good for reſtoring Health, tho' the Patient died of his Diſeaſe preſently after.

But another thing which made the entrance of extreme Unction more eaſy and unſuſpected, was the advantage of time, and the notable preparations that made way for it to come in gradually and inſenſibly, and without the noiſe that violent and ſudden alterations make. By the forms of Unction that obtained in the Tenth Age, it appears that they applied it to the Eyes, the Ears, the Noſtrils, the Lips, the Breaſt, and this with reference to the ſins that had been committed by ſeeing, hearing, &c. * Thus in *Ratoldus* his Form. *I anoint thy Eyes with ſanctified Oyl, that whatever ſin thou haſt committed by unlawful ſeeing, may be expiated by the anointing of this Oyl*; the intention of which kind of

* Menardi Notæ in Sacram. Greg. pag. 337.

of forms is sufficiently explained by that which follows, † *I anoint thee*, &c. *that by the Operation of this Mystery, and the Unction of this Holy Oyl, and our prayer, thou being relieved and cherished mayest through the power of the Holy Spirit be so happy as to obtain thy former and better Health.* By which it is highly reasonable to say, that the anointing the Senses, and the several remarkable parts of the Body with reference to the sins of the sick person, did it self refer to the recovery of his Health; and that the sickness being supposed to be sent for the punishment of some sin or other, they made sure to deprecate all they could think of, that the sin being forgiven, the sickness might be removed. This Form, as * *Menardus* shews, was written in the Tenth Age, as that which was taken out of *Tilius* his Library was in the Eleventh, and that of the Monastery of St. *Remigius* between the Tenth and Eleventh. † They are all of the same strain; and that which I note from them is this, That the plentiful care that is taken in them, for the deprecation of the Guilt of all kind of sins, made the whole Ceremony look something like anointing for the cleansing of the Soul, rather than the recovering of the Body, though this was the direct intention of the whole; and so it was not not so dangerous a leap in the next Age to forget, or at least to take very little notice of the bodily effect which was design'd by Unction, and to turn the whole Mystery into a proper Sacrament for the good of the Soul; especially, since there were many more words used to express the deprecation of Guilt, then in the Prayer for recovery of Health, tho' the former was in order to the later. To this I add also, that in all likelihood this solemn, particular and circumstantial Unction of the several parts of the body, and deprecation of the Guilt contracted by them, was

† Ibid. p. 338.

* Præf. Menardi in Sac. Gr.

† Men. Notæ. p. 140. 334, &c.

it ſelf by degrees brought in, to ſave the credit of Unction, under which the Sick died or recovered; I ſuppoſe, as certainly as they would have done without it. For that care that was taken to anoint them ſo formally for thoſe ſins which were preſumed to have brought that ſickneſs, made the whole buſineſs look as if it were good for the Soul at leaſt, whatever became of the Body. And thus,

3. About the Twelfth Age came *Extreme Unction* into the World, for we can hear no tidings of it from any of the former. And it is therefore no *Primitive* practice, as the *Firſt* Unction of the Sick was, nor *Antient* practice, as the Second was; but an Innovation that crept in when the middle Ages of the Church were now advancing apace to the laſt. It was begotten in that thick Night of Ignorance and Barbariſm, that ſhuffled this and ſome other Children of Darkneſs into the Weſtern Church. It was licked into ſome ſhape, and brought to a Form of Doctrine by the Schoolmen; and being almoſt grown to what it now is, it was publickly owned by *Eugenius* IV. at the cloſe of the *Florentine* Synod, in the year 1438. to be the *Fifth* Sacrament; and in the next Age came to be eſtabliſhed under *Anathemas* by the Fathers of *Trent*.

And now if we compare theſe *Three* ſeveral *Unctions of the Sick*, one with another, the Differences will appear to be theſe:

The Antient Unction did indeed agree with the Primitive one in this, that both were applied for the Recovery of bodily Health: But then in this they differed, as we obſerved before, that the Primitive Unction was applied but to ſome ſick perſons, and that by the direction and impulſe of the Holy Spirit; but the Ancient Unction was applied to all the ſick, and grew to be a

 ſettled

ſettled Office in the Church; and therefore there was this difference alſo, that by the Primitive Unction all were reſtor'd to Health who were anointed; not ſo by the Antient one; and if a man may freely ſpeak his mind, it had juſt ſuch a ſupernatural effect upon the Bodies of the Sick, as the New Unction of the *Roman* Church has upon the Souls of the Dying, that is, none at all.

This new Unction, which they call *Extreme*, is vaſtly different from the *Antient* one in many points, ſome of which I ſhall briefly repreſent in that Order wherein Mr. *Daille* has more largely conſidered them. || Ubi ſupra. Cap. 18.

1. The end of the Ancient Unction was the recovery of bodily Health; but the end of *Extreme* Unction is to prepare the Soul for its paſſage into the other life. This was one of the antient Forms of Unction. (f) *I anoint thee with Holy Oyl in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; that by the Operation of this Myſtery, being cheriſhed, thou maieſt be ſo happy as to obtain thy former and better Health.* But in the *Roman* Church this is all, *By this Holy Unction, and by his moſt Holy Mercy, God forgive thee whatſoever ſin thou haſt committed, by Seeing, Hearing, Taſting, Smelling, and Touching.* Amen.

(f) Vide Menardi Not. in Sacram. Greg. p. 341. Vide etiam Vetuſtiores Formulas in Caſſandr. Schol. in Hymn. Eccl. p. 288.

2. There is a great difference alſo, touching the perſons anointed, which according to the *Roman* Unction, are thoſe only who are *baptized*, and amongſt theſe none but the *ſick*, and of theſe only *the adult*, and ſuch as are in all appearance *dying* perſons. But it was quite otherwiſe in the antient Church. For they anointed thoſe that were (g) *preparing for Baptiſm*; they anointed thoſe that were (h) *poſſeſſed*; they anointed (i) *Infants*, and, which is the moſt remarkable difference of all, they anointed not dying perſons, but the ſick of whoſe recovery they had reaſonable hopes; as we have proved before.

(g) Innoc. III. ubi ſupra. (h) Beda in Jac. v. (i) Caſſand. Schol. in Hymn. Eccl. p. 289.

before. The antient Unction in all theſe reſpects being ſuitable to the end of it, which was bodily Health, as the *Roman* Unction is in every one of them accommodated to its pretence of being a Sacrament for the forgiving of ſins, and the ſaving of the Soul.

(*k*) Caſſand ubi ſupra. p. 288.

3. Accordingly the (*k*) antient Unction was applied to thoſe parts of the Body, as near as they could, which were the ſeat of the diſeaſe; but the *Roman* Unction pretending to purifie the Soul, is applied to the Five Senſes, to the Feet and the Reins, as to the ſeats of ſin.

* Menard. ubi ſupra.

4. The Antients * anointed for ſeven days together, plainly thereby intimating the hope they had of doing good upon the Patient, by repetition of the Remedy. The *Romaniſts* anoint but once in a diſeaſe, and this according to the order of the Council of *Trent*.

5. The Antients firſt anointed, then gave the Euchariſt; firſt they tried the Remedy for the Body, then they gave the *Viaticum* for the ſoul. The *Romaniſts* make their Unction the laſt of all the Sacraments, doing thereby agreeably to their practice, which is to anoint for the cleanſing of the ſoul, when there is now little or no hope of the Body.

6. Laſtly, The Unction of the Ancients might be adminiſtred by Lay-perſons; but the *Roman* Sacrament muſt not be applied by any but by a Presbyter at leaſt. To which I add, that

It agrees with the antient Unction in that point only, wherein the antient differs from the Primitive, *i. e.* that whereas the *Primitive* Unction was directed by the ſpirit; on the other hand, as the *antient* Unction was under a ſetled Office for the anointing of all the Sick, ſo the *Roman* Unction is reduced alſo to a ſetled Office for the anointing of all (with ſuch reſtrictions as we obſerved before) that are deſperately Sick, or dying. And

And thus the Antient Unction agrees with the Primitive, as a mixed colour does with white; but there is no more likeneſs between the *Primitive* and the *Roman* Unction, than there is between white and black. Thus much for the Occaſions, the Time, and the Nature of that Change which has been made in this matter of the Unction of the Sick.

SECT. IX.

That this Innovation was not univerſal, the Unction of the Greek *Church at this day being not Extreme Unction, but that of the Antients.*

Bellarmin concludes his Argument from the Tradition of the Antients, with the Teſtimony of the *Greek* Church, (*m*) *Which*, he ſays, *is to have its weight, becauſe ſince it appears that the* Greeks *received not their Rites from the* Roman *Church, at leaſt for five hundred years laſt paſt, ſince they were ſeparated from it, it is certain that thoſe things in which they agree are more antient than the Schiſms and Hereſies which aroſe afterwards.* Now that conſequence which the Cardinal here affirms to be *certain*, is moſt certainly falſe, unleſs it be impoſſible that two Churches which are faln out, ſhould afterwards agree in the ſame Innovation for reaſons either common to both, or peculiar to each, and this without any agreement in thoſe things which firſt made the breach between them.

(*m*) Ubi ſupra Sect. Accedat denique, &c.

But that which he ſuppoſes, is as falſe, *viz.* that *Extreme Unction* has the Teſtimony of the *Greek* Church. For his firſt proof of it is a ſhameleſs falſhood, *viz.* That *the Greeks did without contradiction receive the inſtruction of the* Armenians, *where Extreme Unction is numbred amongſt*

mongſt other Sacraments. For it appears plainly by the Acts of the *Florentine* Synod, that the *Greeks* were gone from *Florence* four Months before that inſtruction was given by the Pope to the *Armenians.*

As for the Patriarch *Jeremy* and his other Authors, 'tis true indeed, they atteſt the Unction of the Sick in the *Greek* Church, and that with them it goes for one of their Sacraments. But that it is *Extreme Unction*, we utterly deny. And to ſhew the Cardinals confidence, it will be enough to produce the Teſtimony of one of his Authors, *Simeon Theſſalonicenſis*, as he is quoted by that Latinizing *Greek* (o) *Arcudius* himſelf: *Here another opinion of the Innovating* Latins *is overthrown; for theſe men ſay, that the holy Oyl ought not to be given to thoſe that have hope of life, but to thoſe that are dying, becauſe it confers remiſſion of ſins; judging and practiſing quite contrary to what the Apoſtle ſays, as in all other things, ſo alſo in this. For whereas the Brother of our Lord cries out,* And the Lord ſhall raiſe him up; *theſe men ſay it is to be given to thoſe who are not raiſed up.* And again, *The* Latins *who Innovate in all things, have corrupted this Rite alſo, and ſay it is not to be applied to the Sick, but to the Dying. For becauſe this Sacrament forgives ſins, it muſt be ſo, leſt the perſon recovering ſhould ſin again. O what a madneſs is this! The Brother of our Lord ſaith,* That the prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up. *But theſe men ſay, that he ſhould die. There is no no ſtopping them, you ſee, that are tumbling down a precipice.* And if he has committed ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him; *that is to ſay, that he may recover his health, and be raiſed up. And this our Saviour ſhewed, ſaying to the man ſick of the Palſie,* Thy ſins are forgiven thee, ariſe and walk. And behold thou art made whole; ſin no more, leſt a worſe thing happen to thee. *But theſe*

(o) Arcud. de Extr. Unct. cap. 7. Sect. *His ita*, &c.

these men contrary to our Saviour and his Apostles, say, that 'tis not to be given to the Sick that they may recover, but to those that are to die. Is not this an admirable Testimony to *Extreme Unction?* I know *Arcudius* was very angry with this Author, and took a vast deal of pains to bring the two Churches together in this point; but 'tis like the labour of making Iron and Clay hold together, when the applying of more strength makes them fall asunder the faster.

For which I shall not desire the Reader to take my word, but to judg between *Arcudius* and *Simeon*, by the *Greek Ritual* it self; to which I appeal the more willingly, because (*p*) the Cardinal also was so hardy as to appeal to it. (*p*) Ubi supra.

The Form of Unction in that (*q*) Book has this Title, *The Office of Holy Oyl sung by seven Priests, assembled in the Church, or in a House.* The Prayers and Songs which express their intention are such as these (*r*), *My Saviour and only God, who in mercy and compassion healest the sufferings of Souls, and the wounds of Bodies, do thou restore health to this person afflicted with diseases.* (*s*) *By the streams of thy mercy, and the anointings of thy Priests, do away the pains, and the illness, and the growing languishment of this person, who is subdued by the distress of his sufferings, that being recovered, he may glorifie thee with thanks.* These and the like prayers, I say, shew the intention of Anointing the Sick in that Church, as the Ritual it self speaks in these words: (*t*) *Regard favourably our prayers who meet in thy holy Temple this day to anoint thy infirm persons with holy Oyl.* This goes before the Consecration of the Oyl. But after that, (*u*) *the Priest takes the holy Oil and anoints him that is to receive the Unction, and is to be prayed for, saying the following Prayer: Holy Father, the Physician of Souls and Bodies,* (*q*) Euchologium, Goar. p. 408.

(*r*) (*s*) Ibid p. 411.

(*t*) Ibid. p. 412.

(*u*) Ibid. p. 417.

who didſt ſend thy only begotten Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, healing every diſeaſe, and redeeming us from death, heal this thy ſervant of his bodily and ſpiritual diſeaſe which has laid hold upon him, and revive him through the Grace of thine Anointed, by the Interceſſions of our Holy Lady, the Mother of God, &c. *By the Protection of the Heavenly Incorporeal Powers, by the virtue of the precious and life-giving Croſs —— of* John *the* Baptiſt —— *the Apoſtles, the Martyrs —— and our Godlike Fathers, the Holy Phyſicians that received no Fees,* Coſmas *and* Damian, Cyrus *and* John, Pantaleon *and* Hermolaus, *&c.*

In this Prayer indeed here is a great deal of wretched ſtuff of another kind; but not a word that looks towards *Extreme Unction*; the whole relating to the intention of the Antient Unction, which was to recover the Sick; and therefore the Prieſt pleads in particular the Interceſſion of thoſe Saints that were ſaid to have been particularly famous for the cure of Diſeaſes. And that which is remarkable in the caſe, is this, that the Rubrick requires every one of the other ſix Prieſts, when he anoints the Sick, to uſe this very Prayer; which plainly ſhews that every one of them anoints for the ſame end and purpoſe. Neither is it any advantage towards the *Roman* pretence, that the Prieſt prays alſo for the cure of the ſpiritual infirmity which holds the ſick perſon; it being evident, as *Simeon Theſſalonicenſis* obſerves, that the diſeaſe of the body being inflicted for the ſin of the ſoul, the cauſe is to be removed, that the effect may ceaſe. Nor indeed is it fit that we ſhould pray for any bleſſing of this life, without imploring Gods pardon of thoſe ſins which make us unworthy of it.

(*w*) Ibid. pag. 418.

At length the ſecond Prieſt prays, (*w*) *O God great and high, who art adored by every creature,* &c. *look upon*

on and hearken unto us thy unworthy ſervants, and when in thy name we bring forth this Oyl, do thou ſend forth the medicines of thy free gift, and the pardon of ſins, and according to the multitude of thy mercies heal theſe perſons, &c.

Then the Third Prieſt to the ſame purpoſe. * *Almighty Lord, Holy King, who doſt chaſtiſe and not deliver to death, who ſupporteſt thoſe that fall, and ſetteſt ſtraight thoſe that are broken, and repaireſt the bodily infirmities of men, we beſeech thee, O our God, to ſend forth thy Mercy upon this Oyl, and upon thoſe that are anointed with it in thy Name, that it may become to them the healing both of Soul and Body, their deliverance from all grief, and every diſeaſe and malady; and laſtly, from all defilement of Fleſh and Spirit. So Lord, ſend thou from Heaven thy healing Virtue: Do thou touch the Body, extinguiſh the Fever, mitigate the pain, and expel every hidden Infirmity. Be thou the Phyſitian of this thy Servant; raiſe him up from the Bed of grief, and the Couch of ſickneſs. Be pleaſed to reſtore him ſafe and every way healthy to thy Church, to pleaſe thee, and to do thy will.* * Ib. p 420.

Of the ſame nature are the Prayers of the following Prieſts; this being repeated after every Goſpel in each adminiſtration, *We ſtill pray for Mercy, Life, Peace, Health, and Deliverance.*

I ſhall only add the beginning of the Prayer offer'd by the Fourth Prieſt; becauſe it ſhews how that Church underſtands the place of St. *James* ſo often mentioned. (x) *Lord who art Good, and the lover of Mankind, the God of tender Compaſſion and great Mercy,* &c. *who by thy Holy Apoſtles haſt given us Authority to undertake the cure of the Infirmities of thy People, do thou alſo cauſe this Oyl to be a means of Healing all thoſe that are to be anointed with it, to be a remedy againſt every diſeaſe, and* (x) Ib. p. 421.

every malady, and a deliverance from evils to thoſe that expect Health from thee, &c.

For by this it appears that the *Greeks*, as the Antients did, underſtand St. *James's* Unction to be the ſame with that of the Apoſtles in St. *Mark*, and conſequently refer it to bodily cures: And that they ground their Authority to anoint the ſick in order to bodily Health, upon theſe places of Scripture ſo underſtood. And now I ſhall make bold to ſay, That there is nothing in their whole *Office of Holy Oyl*, that does in the leaſt favour *Extreme Unction*; but take it all together, 'tis in effect a flat contradiction to it. And therefore to make it look a little *Roman* like, the *Latin* Tranſlator (Father *Goar* by name) has falſified the Rubrick before the Prayer that is to be repeated by every Prieſt, and with very convenient impudence rendered it thus: (y) *And after the Prayer* [of Conſecration] *the Prieſt taketh the Holy Oyl, and anointeth him that receiveth EXTREME UNCTION, ſaying the following Prayer.* Whereas he ought to have tranſlated it thus —— *and Anointeth him that waiteth there for Unction and Prayer.* Not, *that receiveth Extreme Unction*, as the falſe Tranſlator would have it.(z) Other Prevarications of leſs moment, I have obſerved, whereby he has ſhewn a good will to bend the Office by Tranſlation, even where he could get next to nothing by it. But if Teſtimonies are not to be had, and yet men will not be content without them, there is no help for it, but they muſt be made.

(y) Καὶ μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν λαμβάνει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐλαίου, καὶ χρίει τὸν ποιοῦντα τὸ εὐχέλαιον, λέγων τὴν εὐχὴν ταύτην. So is the *Greek* Rubric; but *Goar* renders it, *Et poſt Orationem accipit Sacerdos Sanctum Oleum, & extremam unctionem ſuſcipientem ungit, ſequentem orationem dicens.* p. 417.

(z) Orat. Tert. Sac. Ὁ τὰς σωματικὰς θλίψεις διορθούμενος τῶν ἀνθρώπων is tranſlated, *Qui Corporeas hominum infirmitates in utilitatem eorum diſponis*, whereas διορθούμενος, ſignifies here, *afflicta reparans*, as is tranſlated above.

And

And now I may leave any one to judg betwen *Simeon* and *Arcudius*, who is the True, and who the falſe *Greek*; and likewiſe between *Bellarmin* and *me*, whether the Teſtimony of the *Greek* Church be for or againſt *Extreme Unction.*

The truth is, tho' the *Greek* Church hath in ſome things innovated no leſs than the *Roman*, yet in others ſhe has kept to ancient Tradition, where the *Roman* has not; and of this their Unction is one notable inſtance, which is apparently that Unction which began to take place in the Seventh Age after *Chriſt.* But the *Roman* Unction is ſo far from having Primitive Tradition, that 'tis not ſo much as an ancient Innovation, as the Unction of the *Greek* Church is. 'Tis a Corruption that came into theſe parts of the World, but lately in compariſon; and as it has no Antiquity, ſo it never had Univerſality; and, by the Grace of God, we hope it never ſhall.

PART

PART III.

That the Appeal to Reaſon in behalf of this pretended Sacrament, is altogether vain.

SECT. I.

That the pretence to prove any thing to be a Sacrament by mere Reaſon, is an abſurd Preſumption.

Laſtly, It is *proved by Reaſon*, that *Extreme Unction* is a Sacrament. And this proof, is a *Reaſon taken from Divine Providence*, which as the Cardinal notes, the Council of *Trent* uſed before him. He argues thus, (*a*) 'Since our Lord inſtituted Sacraments, by which, 'as by Divine Aids, we ſhould be aſſiſted in our en- 'trance into the Church, and in our Progreſs in it; ſure- 'ly it is by no means to be believed, that his Divine 'Providence has been wanting in our going out, and 'paſſing from this temporal Militant Church, to the 'other that is Everlaſting; eſpecially, ſince a man is 'never in greater want of help and defence, than in the 'Article of Death, as the Fathers teach every where, '*&c.* For then our Adverſaries aſſail us more powerfully, 'becauſe they ſee their time is ſhort; and man himſelf is 'never more unfit to make reſiſtance, by reaſon of the 'greatneſs of his Pains and Sickneſs. For if this cor- 'ruptible Body is a burden to the Soul, even in its beſt 'eſtate of Health; ſurely, in the very Act of Corrup- 'tion it will be the heavieſt weight of all; and ex- 'perience it ſelf ſhews, that the Sick who are dying can

(*a*) Bell. ubi ſupra. Cap. V. Sect. *Accedit ultimo, &c.*

'can hardly ſo much as lift up their minds to God.

He had tried the Scripture before; he had alſo tried Antiquity; and now at laſt he comes with an Argument diſtinct from all Teſtimony, which he calls *Reaſon*; and which is therefore *mere* Reaſon, becauſe 'tis oppoſed to all Teſtimony.

Now to this Arguing, I have two things to ſay, 1. That to pretend the proof of a Sacrament by meer Reaſon, is it ſelf a moſt unreaſonable thing. 2. That if this way were allowable, yet the Reaſoning inſinuated by the Council, and more diſtinctly explain'd by the Cardinal, is weak and trifling.

Firſt, That to pretend the proof of a Sacrament by mere Reaſon, is a moſt unreaſonable pretence. For Sacraments cannot otherwiſe be proved, than by Teſtimonies of Divine Revelation, becauſe they depend upon Inſtitution.

The Definition of a Sacrament in the Catechiſm of the Council of *Trent*, is this, (*b*) *A Sacrament is a thing ſubject to the Senſes, which by the* INSTITUTION *OF GOD, has the power both to ſignifie, and to effect Holineſs and Righteouſneſs.* This Definition is (*c*) praiſed by the Cardinal, and that for comprehending in few words, thoſe eight Points which himſelf had ſhewed before to belong to the nature of a Sacrament. (*d*) One of thoſe Points was this, that a Sacrament is a *voluntary* or *given* Sign, depending upon *Inſtitution.* And this he affirmed to be a Point which *no one Perſon contradicts*, and that *the thing loudly ſpeaks it ſelf.* Now I would know how 'tis poſſible to prove by meer Reaſon, that God has inſtituted any thing, which to inſtitute, or not to inſtitute, depended upon his own Pleaſure. Thoſe things indeed, which to do, or not to do, is inconſiſtent with the *Nature* of God, we may know by

(*b*) Catech. ad Paroc. part. II. Sect. 1. n. 10.

(*c*) De Sacram in genere, lib. 1. cap. xi. Sect. *Quinta definitio*, &c.

(*d*) Ibid. & cap. ix. Sect. *Tertium eſt ut hoc*, &c.

by mere natural Reaſon: But that ſuch Reaſon can find out thoſe *things of God*, which depended upon his Will and Pleaſure, or that Reaſon ſhould be able to prove them otherwiſe than by Teſtimonies of Revelation, is a diſcovery that I believe was never heard of before. St. *Paul*, I am ſure, was quite of another mind. (e) *For*, ſays he, *what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man, which is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.* Which Maxim the Apoſtle uſed in a Diſcourſe againſt the *Greek* Philoſophers, and therefore could not be thought to ſupport the credit of it by his Authority, but to lay it down as a point Point evident to common Reaſon. Since, therefore Sacraments properly ſo called, do by the Confeſſion of the Church of *Rome*, ſtand upon Inſtitution, and did depend upon the free Will and Pleaſure of God; the very pretence to prove *Extreme Unction* to be a Sacrament by Reaſon, abſtracted from Divine Teſtimonies, muſt needs be abſurd; if abſurd it be, to go about a thing that is impoſſible to be done, even by that mans Principles who pretends to do it; eſpecially, if thoſe Principles are ſo clear and evident, that *no one Perſon contradicts them.*

(e) 1 Cor. ii. 11.

But this pretence of the Cardinal, might be eaſily forgiven, if it were not as arrogant, and preſumptuous, as 'tis abſurd. For to conclude, that in matters depending upon the Pleaſure of God, he hath done that which ſeemeth beſt to our Reaſon; is to ſuppoſe that in theſe things we know what is beſt, no leſs than God doth; that we have weighed all the Conveniences and Inconveniences of either ſide, the Advantages and Diſadvantages of every thing that lies before us; the Arguments for, and the Objections againſt this or that; with the ſame exactneſs, wherein they are comprehended in his

infinite Underſtanding. The Cardinal might as well have ſaid in plain terms, God ought to have inſtituted the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*; and therefore he has done it. For he tells us, (*f*) That *it is by no means to be believed that his Divine Providence has been wanting in our going out of this Militant Church*, &c. If, therefore God has not inſtituted the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, to convey us ſafely out of this World; *it is to be believed*, that he hath *been wanting* to his Church; but it is not to be believed that he hath been wanting, becauſe he ought not ſo to be, and therefore he hath inſtituted that Sacrament. Which arguing has not the leaſt appearance of *Senſe*, without the help of another Propoſition, which gives it more than the appearance of Blaſphemy, That *it is by no means to be believed*, that God is wiſer than a Cardinal, or a Council.

(*f*) Certe nullo modo credendum eſt defuiſſe Divinam ejus Providentiam, &c.

Indeed, when once the Inſtitutions of God are revealed and teſtified to us, we muſt not only conclude, that they are Wiſe and Good, becauſe they are his, but we ought alſo to take notice of thoſe footſteps of Divine Wiſdom and Goodneſs, which are diſcernable in them. And the more that a wiſe man conſiders and underſtands their ends and uſefulneſs, the more worthy of their Author he will find them to be. But their congruity to our Reaſon is not the proof of their Divine Inſtitution, ſince there are very many things, which to our finite Underſtandings would appear as uſeful and as reaſonable, but which yet God hath not inſtituted. And therefore, unleſs we knew all thoſe Relations of things to one another, which God only knows, when we conſider the Myſteries of Religion; we ought to conclude that he hath appointed what is beſt for us, not ſo much, becauſe of that Wiſdom and

Goodneſs which we diſcern in his Inſtitutions, though we are able to diſcover a great deal, as becauſe theſe Inſtitutions are his.

I am ſure that our Lord inſtituted two Sacraments for his Church, *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt*. I ſee clearly, that as they were accommodated to ſome Cuſtoms of the *Jewiſh* Church, to which the Goſpel was firſt to be Preached, ſo in all reſpects that I can think of, they are wiſely contrived for the *Chriſtians* of the Gentiles too: that they ſignifie the moſt important duties and motives of the Goſpel, and that their ſignification is eaſie and obvious; that they repreſent the greateſt Grace of God towards ſinners in this life, and this by very lively and inſtructing ſigns; that they are framed to quicken a reaſonable ſervice of God, to excite a wiſe devotion in the people, and to command humble reverence from all; that there is nothing wanting in them to admoniſh us of our great obligations, and to give comfort where comfort is due, by being pledges to us of that Grace which they ſignifie, if we apply our ſelves to that Duty which they ſignifie too: Laſtly, that they are accommodated to our imperfect ſtate, who are clothed with this fleſh and blood, and ſeem to need therefore ſome ſenſible and ſolemn Myſteries to aſſiſt that vital and ſpiritual part of Religion, which begins in the ſoul, and runs through the life; But yet that they are not ſo many as to amuſe a Chriſtian with an outward pomp, or to be an occaſion of diverting him from the inward worſhip of God, or of abating the ſenſe of that pure and undefiled Religion before God, which conſiſts in a life of charity and purity.

There are very many advantages and conveniences which I diſcern in theſe two Sacraments, now that they are eſtabliſhed by the Authority of our Lord Jeſus.

But

But if there had not been good proof of their Inſtitution, I truſt in God that all the Reaſons of convenience which the wit of man could have brought together, ſhould never have carried me to this ſaucy concluſion, *Therefore God hath appointed theſe two Rites to be Sacraments in his Church, for the ſignifying and conveying of his Grace to ſinners.*

Even where the appointments of God are evident, that wiſdom and goodneſs which I can diſcover in them, is not the proper ground of my aſſurance that he hath eſtabliſhed them, for that is no other than *the evidence of the Inſtitution.* Nor can that diſcovery alone give me the leaſt aſſurance that in making ſuch proviſion he hath not been wanting to our needs; for the Reaſon of that aſſurance is this, that it is *He*, it is *God*, I ſay, *that hath made ſuch proviſion for us.*

When it once appears what God hath inſtituted in order to our Salvation, and no more, we are to conclude that this is enough in its kind, becauſe 'tis all that God hath done. But for that other kind of arguing, that God has been wanting to us in his Inſtitutions, if he has not inſtituted *Extreme Unction*, and therefore he has inſtituted it; I leave it to thoſe whoſe concluſions need it; very much deſiring them to conſider what a cauſe that muſt be, which drives them to ſuch bold reaſonings as theſe are. (g) For, as St. *Paul* ſaith, *who hath known the mind of the Lord that he may inſtruct him? But we have the mind of Chriſt.* (g) 1 Cor. 11. 16.

SECT. II.

That the Reaſon brought to prove that Extreme Unction was fit to be inſtituted, has not ſo much as any probability.

BUT ſecondly, *If it were an allowable way to conclude a Divine Inſtitution from what appears to us fit to have been Inſtituted, yet the reaſon of this kind uſed by* Bellarmin *and the Council of* Trent *in behalf of Extreme Unction, has not ſo much as the face of probability.*

It was rather a juſt indignation, than the need of uſing many words to make the thing plain, that held me ſo long in the former Anſwer: And it is ſuch another excuſe that I muſt make for inſiſting at all upon this. For if it be in it ſelf abſurd and a diſhonourable reflection upon Almighty God to pretend to prove Sacraments by meer natural reaſonings; then how plauſible ſoever thoſe reaſonings may ſeem to be, they deſerve no other anſwer than ſilence and contempt. But there is this temptation to ſay ſomething to 'em, if it be but to ſhew, that when men will go about to make themſelves, as theſe men in effect have done, as wiſe as God, they are ſo far from *ſpeaking wiſdom*, that they do but betray their own folly and weakneſs. I ſhall therefore ſhew theſe two things: 1. That the Cardinals reaſoning for the Inſtitution of *Extreme Unction* from the congruity of the thing, is mean and trifling. 2. That if this point were to go by ſuch arguing, there are much more plauſible things to be ſaid againſt it, than he has produced for it.

His reaſon from the congruity of the thing, in ſhort, is this, That becauſe we have one Sacrament to aſſiſt us in our *entrance* into the Church, and ſome others in our *progreſs*

greſs in it, therefore 'tis not to be believed that God ſhould be ſo wanting to us, as not to add yet another to aſſiſt us in *going out* of this Militant Church, becauſe then we have the greateſt need of a Sarcrament. But this reaſoning is liable to many troubleſome Objections.

1. Whereas a Reaſon to prove that God hath inſtituted a certain Sacrament, becauſe otherwiſe he had been wanting to us in our need; when as ſuch a Reaſon, I ſay ought to be of the plaineſt and moſt convincing kind; this is very far from it; being founded upon a meer Analogy, and that a congruity rather of words than things. There is one Sacrament to let us in, and others to carry us on, and therefore there muſt be yet another to bring us off. This is what the Cardinal calls Reaſon, but in truth it looks more like the wantonneſs of a Fancy that cannot be quiet without two ſets of Things to make a handſome Figure one againſt another; that as there is *Entring in*, and *Going on*, and *Paſſing out* on the one ſide, ſo there may be a Figure of three Kinds of Sacraments to anſwer thoſe three ſtates on the other. If it be ſaid, that the force of the Argument lies in the great danger we are in when death is at hand; I anſwer, That does by no means imply the need of a proper Sacrament to aſſiſt in that danger. For if God pleaſes, he can then give ſufficient aſſiſtance without any Sacrament at all; or if he intended to aſſiſt by a Sacrament, there is I am ſure nothing in the nature of the thing to hinder, but that he may aſſiſt by the reception of the Euchariſt at the hour of death, though it be not a Sacrament proper to the Dying. And if this be true, there is nothing in the Argument, why God muſt needs have appointed *Extreme Unction* for the Dying; but that the Number *Three* ought go round, for the pleaſing of their Imaginations, who are entertained to their

their liking more with regular Figures and Analogies, than with ſubſtantial and uſeful Truth.

I confeſs, I am not very much concerned to ſee men take theſe pretty congruities, and make them reaſons for what they do themſelves, provided they will reſt there, and not make them Rules for what God Almighty does. When (*h*) *Simeon Theſſalonicenſis* tells us why in the *Greek* Church there are Seven Prieſts to anoint the Sick, *viz.* becauſe of all the *Sevens* that he could readily think of, I am very well content; for it being indifferent, whether there were Seven Prieſts or not, an indifferent reaſon, I thought, would ſerve the turn one way or other. But it is not to be endured to put theſe petty Arguings upon the Infinite Wiſdom of God, by obliging him to appoint Sacraments for the ſake of fanciful and neat Analogies.

(*h*) Arcud. ubi ſupra. cap. 3

2. To make this Analogy hold, the Cardinal did not think fit to mention ſome of the Sacraments of his Church, ſome of thoſe I mean that are for the aiding of us in our *progreſs* after *Baptiſm*, as they hold; for in this whole Chapter he mentions none of theſe but the *Euchariſt*. Now with them there are Seven in all, *i. e.* Five between the firſt and the laſt; from which Five indeed he might well have excepted *Holy Matrimony*, and *Holy Orders*, becauſe according to them, theſe two can never meet to the *aſſiſtance* of the ſame perſons in their progreſs through the World, and becauſe they are not neceſſary to all. But the Sacraments of *Confirmation* and *Penance* being added to the Euchariſt, do certainly make *Three* for our *progreſs* in the Church. Nor can I imagin why thoſe two were not remembred, but for fear of ſpoiling the handſomeneſs of the Analogy, and of raiſing an expectation of more than one Sacrament proper for us in our *Egreſs* out of the Militant Church; eſpecially,

eſpecially, ſince our dangers are ſaid to be then greater, and our ſtrength to encounter them leſs than in the whole courſe of our life beſides. The truth is, if the Inſtitution of Sacraments muſt be thought to go by ſuch Congruities as theſe, it would be impoſſible for men to agree about the number and the uſe of Sacraments, till they all agree in the ſame Phanſies of Congruity. And yet nothing in the World ſeems to have greater variety, than Phanſy has.

3. If there were ſome colour of Agrument in a handſom Congruity, yet in one that is ſtrain'd and forced, there is none at all. For ſuch is the congruity of being furniſh'd with a Sacrament for our *going out*, as we are with a Sacrament for our *entring into* the Church. If the oppoſition had been natural, either Baptiſm muſt have received us into the life of this World, as *Extreme Unction* is intended ſo ſecure our paſſage out of it; or *Extreme Unction* muſt ſend us out of the Church, as Baptiſm does enter us into it. No man will ſay the former, nor *Bellarmin* the latter; and therefore he was fain to add the conſideration of the Churches *Militancy* in this life, to ſave himſelf from the abſurdity of making *Extreme Unction* the Sacrament of our going out of the Church, as Baptiſm is the Sacrament of our entrance into it. But then this ſpoils the congruity of the oppoſition; for he that is baptized, does thereby become a Member of that Church, part whereof is in Heaven; but he that is anointed with *Extreme Unction*, does not thereby, no not when he dies, ceaſe to be a member of that Church, part whereof is upon Earth, if he dies in the Lord. And therefore it cannot be ſaid that he goes out of the Church by death, as he entred into it by Baptiſm: For by death it ſelf he makes a farther progreſs in it.

Beſides, the effect of Baptiſm is this, That thereby we were actually admitted into the Church: But is it the

effect

effect of *Extreme Unction* to paſs us out of the Militant Church? 'Tis the Sacrament of the Dying, they ſay; but what effect has it, if the ſick perſon happens to recover after anointing? Did his anointing aſſiſt him in his paſſage out of this World, though he tarried in it ſtill? Or is it only a Sacrament that confers the Grace proper to it, and is good for its end, if there be occaſion for it? Or a Sacrament by it ſelf, that, when it happens to do no good, will be ſure to do no harm? It is a dangerous thing to lay any great weight upon theſe ſlender congruities.

And therefore diſmiſſing the Analogy of *Extreme Unction* to Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, and the congruity of providing a Sacrament for our *Egreſs*, to anſwer the Sacraments of *Ingreſs* and *Progreſs*, we have nothing to conſider, but the ſingle congruity of providing ſufficent aſſiſtance for the Faithful, in ſo dangerous an hour as the hour of death. But to this alſo I have ſpoken already; and ſhall now add,

1. That we do not in the leaſt doubt, but as God is preſent with his faithful Servants in all conditions of life to deliver them out of Temptation, ſo he will not forſake them in the hour of death, nor then ſuffer them to be tempted above what they are able; but we ſay that this does not infer any the leaſt need, or even congruity that he ſhould therefore inſtitute a Sacrament proper for the comfort and aſſiſtance of the Dying; ſince if he is pleaſed upon our Prayer to give the aſſiſtance of his Holy Spirit in that caſe without ſuch a Sacrament, our needs in that time of danger are as effectually ſupplied, as if ſuch a Sacrament had been added. And therefore *Chemnitius* did well to ſay, That other guards and defences are not to be ſought for the dying, than thoſe that are provided for the living; *viz.* the Word of God, the re-

remembrance of Baptiſm, and the reception of the Euchariſt, which are all profitable to the dying. And (*h*) *Bellarmin* did very ill to anſwer, that at this rate there would be no need of the *Euchariſt* after Baptiſm. For in order to the receiving of Divine Grace, we muſt obſerve Divine Inſtitutions. God was not bound to inſtitute Sacraments for us, and I think no man will deny, but if he had pleaſed, he could have ſaved us without them; but when he has once inſtituted them, we are bound to obſerve them, if we expect Grace to help us in the time of our need.

(*h*) Ubi ſupra. Cap. V.

2. If it were true that a ſufficient aid could not be provided in the dangerous hour of death, but by a Sacrament proper and ſpecial to the caſe, ſuch as *Extreme Unction* is ſuppoſed to be; then they of the Church of *Rome* muſt either ſay that God has been wanting to thoſe dying perſons for whom he has not provided ſuch a Remedy, or elſe that themſelves are horribly to blame in refuſing it to them. For they do not adminiſter *Extreme Unction*, but to thoſe that are dying of ſickneſs; for if a man is to die a violent death, or be in imminent danger of death any other way than by a diſeaſe; according to their Doctrine and Practice, he is not to be anointed with *Extreme Unction*. But if it be the proper guard of the dying, all reaſon in the World requires that it ſhould be adminiſtred to the later, no leſs than the former. They that are to to die a violent death, need ſupport and comfort not leſs, but rather more than thoſe that are dying a *natural* death, as we uſe to call it; and they are every whit as capable of the ſpiritual advantages of the pretended Sacrament, as theſe are; and one would think, ſomething more than many of them. For we are told that (*i*) *becauſe in paſſing out of this World there are ſpecial difficulties, therefore our Lord has in-*

(*i*) Bell. ubi ſupra.

inſtituted a ſpecial help and defence : Chiefly becauſe it often happens that they who are drawing on, can neither hear the word of Exhortation, nor receive the Euchariſt, being oppreſſed by their Diſeaſe, and deprived of the uſe of their Senſes; but they may be anointed and receive the fruit of this Sacrament. Now what the ſpiritual dangers or difficulties are or can be of thoſe who have thus far ſafely advanced towards their end, as to *be deprived of the uſe of their Senſes*, I am not able to imagin; for it ſeems evident to me, that if through the Grace of God, they have to that moment well acquitted themſelves, the Devil may from that time be ſuffered to do his worſt upon them, nor can there be any need of *Extreme Unction* to guard and fortifie them, who now are out of all danger of their ſpiritual enemies. But thoſe who are yet in their full health, and know they muſt die by violence in a few Minutes, though they are ſubject to the Terrors of Death, and capable of receiving comforts againſt it; though they underſtand their own needs, and can ſubmit to remedies; muſt, it ſeems, be left without this ſpecial guard of *Extreme Unction*; while they are to be anointed, and to receive the fruit of this Sacrament, who are paſt all apprehenſion of any thing that can be ſaid or done to them, and in all appearance are as incapable of receiving any benefit by it, as if they were ſtark dead. But this I confeſs, that there is a notable congruity between the ſuppoſed need of the dying perſons laſt mentioned by the Cardinal, and the ſuppoſed remedy. For *Extreme Unction* will do juſt as much good to the Souls of the Faithful who are deprived of the uſe of their Senſes, as their Adverſary the Devil can do them harm.

SECT.

SECT. III.

That more congruous Reaſoning may be offered againſt it, than for it.

2. *IF this Point were to go by ſuch arguings, there are more plauſible things to be ſaid againſt it, than thoſe which the Cardinal has produced for it.* What he has offered, we have ſeen already. Now it ſeems to be much more ſubſtantial to argue in this manner againſt this pretended Sacrament for the Dying.

1. That there was nothing like it in the *Jewiſh* Church, who yet had abundance of Rites and Ceremonies inſtituted for them by God himſelf. Now if it had been of ſuch mighty conſequence as is pretended, that dying perſons ſhould be provided with a Sacrament proper to their caſe, it is not to be believed, but that God would have furniſhed that People, of whom he took an eſpecial care, with ſomething of this kind; eſpecially, ſince their Religion had a vaſt number of Inſtitutions. They had Rites inſtituted by God himſelf, which may be ſaid to anſwer our Baptiſm and Euchariſt; but they had none to paſs them ſafely out of this World, to anſwer the pretence of *Extreme Unction.* And yet their dying needs were the ſame with ours, their ſickneſs as painful, and their Temptations as many; nor can any reaſon be aſſigned, why they ſhould not have been provided with a proper Sacrament in the caſe, as well as we. But yet no ſuch Proviſion was made for them. And therefore it ſhould ſeem that no ſuch proviſion was made for us neither. For if they had no need of ſuch a thing, neither ſhould it be thought needful for us.

2. There is farther to be ſaid from the Reaſon of the thing, That a Sacrament proper for dying perſons would be more liable to be abuſed by placing too much confidence in it, than any other Inſtitution whatſoever. For thoſe careleſs and licentious perſons who are apt to rely more than they ought even upon Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, which are manifeſt engagements to a Holy life for the time to come, would much more eaſily perſwade themſelves, that a Sacrament proper to their dying hour, and which could have no reſpect to any duty to be performed by them afterwards, muſt be of no other uſe in compariſon, than to take away the guilt and impurity which they had contracted heretofore: Which would be a dangerous temptation and encouragement to live as they liſt, in hope of making all good at laſt by a Repentance, and by a Sacrament proper to a Death-bed. It ſeems therefore reaſonable to believe (if People will be ſo bold as to make reaſons for God) that what aſſiſtance God would afford by a Sacrament in the caſe of a dying man ſhould be conferred by means of a Sacrament not proper to a Dying man, but one of conſtant uſe in the courſe of his life, *viz.* The *Euchariſt*, which being alſo a Sacrament no leſs ſignifying our own duty, than the Grace of God, would not ſo eaſily be turned into an occaſion of Preſumption. For becauſe it is a Sacrament that was frequently to be received in the time of Health, therefore when ſick perſons receive it, they muſt be very ſtupid to think it has any other kind of efficacy at that time, than when they received it in their Health, that is to ſay, than a conditional efficacy, conveying to them the Grace which it ſignifies, upon their being qualified as the Sacrament ſuppoſes them to be. But a Sacrament for the dying, has not its efficacy till a little before death; and therefore ſeems not to have much reſpect

to

to conditions, but rather looks like a Reſerve to ſecure thoſe at laſt, who have not lived anſwerably to the Sacraments, that promiſed nothing but upon the condition of a ſober, righteous, and godly life, for the time to come.

But after all, had it pleaſed God to inſtitute *Extreme Unction*, or any other Sacrament proper for the dying, I am not that wretch that would have laid the leaſt weight upon theſe reaſonings, againſt the Divine Inſtitution. Nor do I now offer them as Arguments to prove that God hath not inſtituted any ſuch thing, (for the true ground upon which we affirm there was no ſuch Inſtitution, is, That there is not the leaſt evidence of the Fact) but only to ſhew that the Cardinal was not leſs unfortunate in his Reaſonings themſelves, why God ought to have inſtituted *Extreme Unction*, than preſumptuous in offering to prove it, by any ſuch Reaſonings whatſoever: For tho preſumptions of this kind are not to be brought either for or againſt an Inſtitution under queſtion, yet the preſumptions on our ſide are much more reaſonable than thoſe of his.

SECT. IV.

An Apology for this Controverſie about Extreme Unction, from the great moment of it.

BUT now perhaps it may be asked by one or other, To what good end all this ſerves? Why muſt it be made to appear that Scripture, Reaſon and Antiquity, are all vainly pretended in behalf of *Extreme Unction*? The Opinion and Practiſe of it does not ſtand in defiance to any Inſtitution of our Saviour, or any expreſs Rule of the Goſpel, and might therefore without great harm be indulged, at leaſt not oppoſed, now it has ſpread

as

as far and wide as the *Roman* Communion goes; eſpecially ſince we charge them with ſo many Doctrines and Practices, which as we ſay, do manifeſtly contradict the Scriptures? To inſiſt upon ſmall faults, is to heighten animoſities, and to make our breaches deſperate. And while we charge our Adverſaries with Innovation in the uſe they make of an Antient Rite, as Unction of the Sick is confeſſed to be, they have this at leaſt to return upon us, that we are guilty of as great an Innovation in making no uſe of it at all.

Now as to letting the diſpute fall, there had been ſome reaſon for it, if the Church of *Rome* had either kept to the Ancient Unction, which directly referred to bodily Cures; or if when they were perhaps grown aſhamed of anointing the Sick for the recovery of their health, after long experience had ſhewn that the Remedy was all in vain; if then, I ſay, they had retained the Rite of Unction under the notion of a Rite meerly ſtanding upon Eccleſiaſtical Authority, and whatſoever plauſible ſignification they had given it; if they had aſcribed no more ſpiritual effect to it than to the obſervation of any other mutable cuſtom of the Church; Had they ordered matters thus, and not intermedled againſt the liberty and authority of other Churches, I for my part am of opinion that neither breach of Communion ought to have followed ſuch a proviſion, nor any ſuch controverſies raiſed about it, as would hazard the peace of the Catholick Church.

But the matter is far otherwiſe. They thought it not worth the while, to retain it as a mutable Rite, but have given it the venerable name of a Sacrament, and as much as they can, the nature of a Sacrament too. They have found out a Grace for it, which they ſay it confers, and they have put the invention upon our Lord Jeſus, and the

the recognition of it upon the *Chriſtian* world. They have *Anathematized* all that dare to call it into queſtion; nor are they content to train up their own people in the belief that it takes away ſin, but they would make us ſuch hypocrites as to ſay that we believe it too; for with theſe men we can have no Communion unleſs we (*k*) *profeſs that there are ſeven Sacraments of the new Law, truly and properly ſo called, inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, and neceſſary to the Salvation of mankind*; of which number *Extreme Unction* is one, *and that they do confer Grace*. Thus the caſe ſtands, and as it ſtands, let our enemies themſelves be our Judges, if the truth be on our ſide in this Queſtion, whether we have not all the reaſon in the world to avow it openly, and defend it.

(*k*) Bulla Pii, ſupra Formâ Juramenti, &c.

Beſides that relation of Biſhops and Presbyters to the particular Churches that are under their eſpecial care; they are alſo Miniſters of the Catholick Church, and by virtue of that relation wherein they ſtand to the whole, are bound to declare againſt intolerable abuſes and corruptions that do notoriouſly prevail in any part of it.

There are not many errors of more pernicious conſequence to the ſouls of men, than to be made to believe that forgiveneſs of Sins, Grace, and Salvation, may be attained by things that are bleſt by man, without any appointment of God. Nor is it eaſie to give a worſe inſtance of Treachery in managing the care of ſouls, than to ſupport ſo dangerous a ſuperſtition, by pretending that God is the Author of thoſe Inſtitutions which he never eſtabliſhed, and of thoſe promiſes which he has no where made. What is this but under a pretence of carrying men to heaven, to venture the diverting them out of the only way to it, which God has ſhewn; and to cheriſh a fatal ſuperſtition in the people, to which of themſelves they are ſtrangely prone, inſtead of reproving

ving and correcting it, as the *Prieſts of the living God* ought to do?

It is ſeldom ſeen that people are very much concerned for Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Cuſtoms, for which no other reaſons are pretended but thoſe of Prudence, Order and Expedience. But when they are made Myſteries, good to take away ſin, and to ſave the ſoul, no degree of zeal is thought to be too great for them. Men love to be ſaved by a multitude of Ceremonies, and a Prieſt to adminiſter them. But ſurely it is not ſo much the buſineſs of a *Chriſtian* Prieſt to make himſelf neceſſary by deceiving and pleaſing others, as to pleaſe God, and to profit the flock of *Chriſt*. He ſhould be content with ſo much dependence of the people upon him, as may be kept by ſpeaking truth, and doing his duty. But as for them that do not think this to be enough, but pretend to have ways of Gods appointing to take away ſin, which yet are meer inventions of their own, do they not at once abuſe the name of God, and gratifie their own ambition at the price of mens ſouls? Certainly if any occaſion of declaring the truth can be juſt, even when we know before hand that many will be offended with it; this is ſuch an occaſion. Expreſs warning ought to be given againſt the deceitful inſinuations of thoſe men, who talk of nothing more violently than the Salvation of ſouls, and who would almoſt make one believe that no body can be ſaved who does not paſs through their hands, nor any body damned that does. For if what they ſay of two of their Sacraments be true, the Sacraments of *Penance*, and of *Extreme Unction*, there is as little cauſe to fear damnation in their Church, as they ſay there is to hope for Salvation in ours. Of Confeſſion in Penance they ſay thus,(*l*) *Granting that ſins are blotted out by contrition, who knows not that it ought to be ſo vehement*

(*l*) Catech ad Par. P. II. de Pænit. Sect. 46, 47.

ment

ment pungent and intenſe, that the bitterneſs of the grief may equal the greatneſs of the ſins? But becauſe very few would reach this degree, therefore the number of thoſe that could hope for the pardon of their ſins this way, muſt have been exceeding ſmall. Whence it was neceſſary that our moſt merciful Lord ſhould provide for the common Salvation of men by an eaſier method, as he has done with admirable wiſdom, in delivering to the Church the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. For according to the Doctrine of the Catholick Faith, all are to believe, and conſtantly to affirm, that whoever is ſo diſpoſed as to be ſorry for the ſins he has done, and withal to purpoſe with himſelf that he will ſin no more, although he is not affected with that grief which may be ſufficient to obtain his pardon, yet when he has duly confeſſed his ſins to a Prieſt, all his ſins are pardoned and forgiven him by the power of the Keys. This is the Doctrine of their Famous *Catechiſm*; and thus far ſufficient care is taken for mortal ſins by the Sacrament of *Penance*, that they ſhall be blotted out upon eaſie terms, if a man does but *Grieve*, and can hold his *intention to amend*, but ſo long till he receives Abſolution. Now this Sacrament being (*m*) to go before *Extreme Unction*, leſt the *conſcience of ſome mortal ſin ſhould hinder the effect of it*; the *greater* ſins are therefore all done away not long before the hour of death. And then for the (*n*) *leſſer* ſins, and (*o*) *any ſins that remain yet to be expiated*, and the *Reliques of ſin*, they are *forgiven* and *wiped away* by *Extreme Unction*. Now if this be true, he muſt be a very wretch indeed that can deſire a milder Goſpel than a Goſpel which comes ſo low as to take ſome grief, and a good reſolution for the forgiveneſs of all that is paſt. For who is ſo bad as not to be ſorry at certain times, and to intend a new life for the future, eſpecially under the fear of death? But tho he ſhould afterwards take leave to *retain* his ſins, yet the Prieſt it ſeems had power to *remit* them before, and he has power to remit them ſo plentifully at laſt, that no *Reliques of ſin* ſhall remain behind, ſince the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* is

(*m*) Ibid. de Extr. Unct. Sect. 23.

(*n*) Ibid. Sect. 27.

(*o*) Conc. Trid. *Seſſ.* xiv. de Extr. Unct. cap. 2.

that which compleats and (p) *conſummates* the Sacrament of Penance.

(p) Ibid Doctr. de Sacr. Ext. Unct.

And thus 'tis left to the choice of their people, whether they will live according to that Truth which the Ch. of *Rome* holds with us, or according to thoſe Doctrines which they maintain and we reject; to their choice, I ſay, for any reaſon that they have to be afraid of going to Hell, if they have but the benefit of the power of the Keys, and the virtue of that Churches Sacraments. I know indeed that ſome good things are ſaid by the Council in behalf of reformation of life, particularly in the place laſt cited, they ſay that (q) *the whole Chriſtian life ought to be a perpetual Penance*; they meant, I hope, a ſtate of Amendment. But 'tis a very unlikely matter that men ſhould be perſwaded to a holy life, when by thoſe Aſſurances that the Church has given them, they can ſo eaſily perſwade themſelves that they may be ſaved without it. Nor is it very likely that many Confeſſors ſhould withhold either the ſaving uſe of the Keys, or the comfort of that uſe of them from wicked perſons, when they cannot do it without mending the Doctrine of their Church. And if any ſhould be ſo honeſt, there are yet others to be had, together with the word of the Church, to warrant the effect of the Sacraments, againſt the word of a ſingle Prieſt to the contrary.

(q) Ibid.

Againſt ſuch abuſes as theſe, we not only may, but ought to *proteſt*, if we ought to be concerned for the honour of God, and the ſouls of men; that we may warn all thoſe of our own Communion not to *fall from their ſtedfaſtneſs*, and if poſſible, recover thoſe that are led away into theſe dangerous errors; or have been educated in the belief of them.

SECT. V.

The Church of England, *and other Proteſtant Churches, juſtified, in not anointing the Sick at all.*

IF it be laid to our charge that we have no Unction of the Sick, we are very ſure that whatever Unction of the Sick, the Church of *Rome* can tax us for wanting, excepting her

her own, the charge will fall as heavy upon her ſelf.

We do not anoint the Sick as they did in the Primitive Church, becauſe we pretend not to the Supernatural Gift of Healing; and they anoint the Sick for this purpoſe in the Church of *Rome* no more than we.

We do not anoint the Sick as they began to do in the Seventh Age, when all ſick perſons were anointed in order to bodily Cures, but not to prepare their ſouls for death: No more do they of the Church of *Rome*.

We do not anoint neither with *Extreme Unction*, as they indeed do: But the buſineſs of this Diſcourſe has been to ſhew that they ought to do it no more than we.

But the account we have to give of this matter is very plain, and ſuch as will bear us out to any man that asketh us a reaſon, whoever he be. For of thoſe Three Unctions, there is no colour to charge us with blame in omitting any of them, excepting the ſecond, which had the Authority of the middle Ages from the Seventh to the Twelfth. But that we are under no colour of Obligation to be determined by that Authority, is plain to us from theſe three Conſiderations: That it was neither *Primitive*, nor has at any time been *Univerſal*, nor had they who began it any good reaſon for what they did, but were themſelves to blame for beginning it.

1. *It was not Primitive*, ſince by anointing all the Sick for the recovery of their Health, the Seventh Age departed from the example of the Six foregoing Ages, which are and ought to be of greater Authority than thoſe that followed. They had no ſtanding Offices for Unction of the Sick, nor knew of any other but that mentioned by St. *James*, when a Miraculous Cure followed. The Religion of being anointed for Health, by thoſe that had not the Gift of Healing, was ſo unknown a thing to Primitive Antiquity, that a Biſhop of the Fifth Age, wrote to the Pope of *Rome* about

ſomething like it, as men uſe to do of things that had never been heard of before. Thoſe fancies of receiving Health by the uſe of *Chriſm*, began but then to ſtir, which afterwards ſetled into Rules and Offices for anointing all the ſick with Oyl for the Curing of their Diſeaſes. At firſt, in imitation of the Primitive way, not only Prieſts, but all Chriſtians might anoint for that purpoſe. But at length none but Prieſts muſt do it; and as Cuſtoms that are meerly of human Original do commonly begin with a rude and light draught, and in proceſs of time are filled up with artificial and regular Forms; ſo this Innovation which was at firſt begotten by Queſtions concerning the uſe of *Chriſm* in the time of *Innocentius*, grew in two or three Ages more into all its ſhapes, and became a ſetled myſtery. But though in reſpect of us it be indeed an *Antient* Innovation, yet an Innovation it was, and a *late* one too in reſpect of the truly Primitive Church.

2. *It was never Univerſally practiſed*; for beſides the Chriſtians of *St. Thomas* in *Eaſt-India*, who had no uſe of Oyl at all in their Holy things; the *Æthiopian* Church uſeth no Unction of the ſick; tho they have their (*r*) Holy Oyl, wherewith they anoint perſons to be Baptized; and ſo when the Miſſionaries from *Rome* came thither, they found theſe Chriſtians (*s*) *utterly ignorant of Extreme Unction*; which by the way is a good evidence, if there were no other, that even the Unction which was not Extreme, was an Innovation. For (*t*) no people are more tenacious than they of Antient Cuſtoms; inſomuch that *the moſt Antient Ceremonies of the Old Church that are obſolete elſewhere, and now hardly known, are ſeen to continue amongſt them; ſo that their Rites being well conſidered in Baptiſm, the Euchariſt, Love-Feaſts*, &c. *one would think he ſaw a kind of Image of the Primitive Church*, as we are told in the beſt account that was ever yet given of the ſtate of that Church.

(*r*) Ludolf. Lib. III. Cap. 6. N. 31.

(*s*) Ibid. Cap. V. N. 44.

(*t*) Ibid. Cap. VI. N. 14, 15.

3. They that began this kind of Unction, had no good Reaſon for what they did, and it is much eaſier to *defend* our

our ſelves in refuſing to follow that example, than them for ſetting it. It may indeed be *excuſed* by a Pious intention of ſeeking Health this way from God, and refering it all to him; but thus may many other things be excuſed, which yet ought not to be imitated. Here was inded the Primitive Rite of Unction uſed, and that alſo for the ſame general end, for which it was uſed in the Primitive Church, *viz.* The Raiſing up of the Sick; but it was far from having the ſame ground and reaſon, becauſe it could be of no effect, the Gift of healing being diſcontinued: Which in truth made it look as untowardly, as if to recover any one to hearing and ſpeech, they had ordered the Prieſt to *put his Finger into the Ears*, and to *touch the Tongue of* the Patient becauſe (*u*) our Lord did with ſuch ſigns recover one that was *deaf, and had an impediment in his Speech*; or that when the Prieſt could not himſelf go to pray over a ſick perſon, he ſhould ſend him a *Handkerchief* or an *Apron from his Body*, becauſe (*w*) ſuch things being carried to the ſick from the Body of St. *Paul*, their *Diſeaſes departed from them.* For the reaſon of the thing ſeems to be much the ſame in all the three caſes. It is not very diſcreet, nor for the Honour of Religion to make any ſhew of a Miracle, when none is like to follow; nor to uſe a Religious Rite for healing the Sick, which promiſes extraordinary matters, and yet People die as they did before; which experience was in all probability the reaſon of changing the middle Age *Unction*, into *Extreme Unction*; they were aſhamed and weary of anointing for the Body, and ſo fell to anoint for the Soul. The *Greek* Church indeed ſtill retains that Unction for Health; but how unable ſhe is to defend it, may be obſerved from (*x*) *Arcudius*, who brings in *Simeon Theſſalonicenſis* pleading againſt the Unction of the *Latins*, himſelf doing what he can to defend it againſt the *Greeks*. The caſe in ſhort is this, That they are both right, one againſt the other, as it muſt needs be when Two notable Antagoniſts do each of them maintaintain a different error. *Simeon*, aswell he might,

(*u*) Mark. vii.

(*w*) Acts xx. 12.

(*x*) De Extr. U. Lib. V. p. 466, &c.

con-

condemn'd the *Latins* for anointing dying perſons, contrary to St. *James*. *Arcudius*, as well he may, does almoſt laugh at *Simeon* and his *Greeks*, for their anointing in order to bodily Health, as if they thought to make men Immortal, and not ſuffer death to reign amongſt them any more. Our Church is to be praiſed for not being led away by a colour of Antiquity to expoſe her ſelf in this Faſhion. And it is the glory of a Church, that ſhe is able to defend not only the bare lawfulneſs, but the prudence and expedience alſo of her Conſtitutions.

In ſhort, the Unction of the middle Ages, has neither Authority great enough, nor reaſon good enough to recommend it. And the Church of *England* is therefore by no means to blame, for not taking up that Unction, when ſhe laid down the other that is incomparably worſe.

SECT. VI.

An Addreſs to the Laity of the Roman *Communion.*

AND now in the Cloſe of all, I would fain addreſs my ſelf to the Gentlemen of the Church of *Rome*, in ſuch manner as might incline them to conſider what has been ſaid.

As for thoſe of them that are in Orders, it belongs to them particularly to conſider it, and I have no other application to make to them, but that if I have gone upon miſtakes, they would imploy ſome charitable hand to ſhew me where they lye. But in the mean time, I hope the following Addreſs to the Laity of that Communion will not be thought unreaſonable.

Brethren, we are ſenſible at what diſadvantage we endeavour to lay the Truth before you; we know that the prejudices which have been infuſed into you againſt all that we can ſay, are very great; but we would fain hope that they are not invincible. What is it, I beſeech you, in thoſe Guides you follow, to make you depend altogether upon their Authority? What is it in us that ſhould make every thing we ſay, ſuſpected and ſlighted? We do not love to enter into compariſon; but we can ſee no good reaſon for ſo great a difference.

rence. If you ſay that they can teach nothing but truth in delivering the Doctrine of your Church; certainly, it ought to be a very ſtrong Reaſon that can ſupport ſuch a perſwaſion; a perſwaſion that whatſoever they ſay againſt us is True *in General*, againſt a terrible evidence, that 'tis all Falſe in the *Particulars*: Eſpecially, when we produce ſuch Evidence from thoſe Authorities upon which the General perſwaſion is ſaid to be built, *i.e.* from Scripture and Antiquity.

For Antiquity, many of you at leaſt muſt rely upon the skill and fidelity of others; and for our parts we deſire to be truſted, but as we deſerve. We think, the clearneſs of the Teſtimonies we produce, the manner of our citing Authors, and the connexion with which we take their periods, may induce a prudent perſon, who himſelf is unacquainted with the Fathers, to believe that we are fair Repreſenters of Antiquity.

For Scripture, that indeed is a Rule which you may, but will not uſe; for let us produce places of Holy Writ never ſo many or ſo clear, you refer the Interpretation of them, to thoſe Guides againſt whom they are produced. So that ſtill they are believed upon their own Teſtimony.

Is it becauſe you take their Skill and Learning to be greater than ours? But how can you be ſure of that, without examining the different appearance which that difference would make in the management of theſe Controverſies?

Or do you believe us to be Hypocrites, and that ſincerity is to be met with no where, but in the Guides of your Communion? *We are Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of the Myſteries of God, no leſs than* they; and we know that *it is requir'd of Stewards that a man be found faithful.* Conſider us, Brethren, that neither our Doctrine nor our Converſation in the World, carry the marks of Hypocriſy. Had we any other Intereſt to ſerve, but that of Truth, we alſo ſhould contend for Myſteries, by which the People get *Eaſe* and Liberty, and the Prieſt *Power*. We tax not your Prieſts of Inſincerity, nor enquire why they teach certain Doctrines, and adminiſter thoſe Sacra-

craments which they do, and which we do not adminiſter. We leave them to give an account of their ends and motives, at the Day of Judgment, when the ſecrets of all Hearts ſhall be diſcloſed. But for our ſelves, we muſt needs ſay, That if we were diſpoſed to bend Religion to Worldly Intereſt, we ſhould maintain another part than what we are now concern'd for. To make the moſt of our Orders, we are very ſure that you ought to depend upon us for forgiveneſs of your ſins while you live, and when you are dying; and yet not ſo to be forgiven, but that there ſhould be a reckoning of Temporal puniſhment behind, which would make us neceſſary for you when you are dead. Though you ſtill purpoſe Reformation of Life without performance, we would have Sacraments to ſave you from *Hell*; but a life of ſtrict Piety and Virtue, tho' crowned with *Extreme Unction*, ſhould not excuſe you from *Purgatory* without a farther favour of the Church, that ſhould not be eaſily obtained neither. You cannot conclude that we are Inſincere, but at the ſame time you muſt take us for the veryeſt Fools alive, to ſtand as we do in our own Light, and to prefer a Hereſie that does us no manner of Service, before that Truth which would bring all to depend upon us. Think upon this, and conſider at leaſt that you have no Reaſon to ſuſpect us of not believing our ſelves what we profeſs, or of conſulting our ſecular Intereſt, when we intreat you for the love of God, and for the ſake of your own Souls to weigh impartially what we ſay; which if you would do, we doubt not in the leaſt, but you would find our *Cauſe* to be as good as our *meaning*. Only let not prejudice extinguiſh the very deſire of knowing better things, nor an † Oath to yield to no manner of Argument, prevail againſt that Obligation to follow God and Truth, which all the Oaths in the World can never diſſolve.

† Pontif. Rom. Ordo ad Reconc. Apoſt. &c.

THE END.

289402